



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

BP 302.16.4

no. 1040







**THE**  
**BRITISH CRITIC,**  
**QUARTERLY**  
**THEOLOGICAL REVIEW,**  
**AND**  
**Ecclesiastical Record.**

---

**VOLUME XV.**

---

**LONDON:**  
**PRINTED FOR J. G. & F. RIVINGTON,**  
**ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD, AND WATERLOO-PLACE, PALL-MALL;**  
**AND**  
**SOLD BY BELL AND BRADFUTE, EDINBURGH; AND**  
**MILLIKEN, DUBLIN.**

**1834.**

~~CP 1915~~

△

~~BP 302.16~~

BP 302.16.4

✓



LONDON:  
C ROWORTH AND SONS, BELI. VARD,  
TEMPLE BAR.

31-132  
6-5-32

## INDEX OF BOOKS REVIEWED.

•• For Remarkable Passages in the Criticisms, Extracts, and Ecclesiastical Record, see the Index at the end of the Volume.

---

*Abbott* (Jacob), *The Teacher*, 434.

*Adams* (Rev. J.), *Convention Sermon*, 240.

*Aikin* (Lucy), *Memoirs of the Court of King Charles I.*, 48.

*Anderson* (Rev. Robert), *Practical Exposition of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans*, 85.

---

*Beman* (Rev. Dr. William), *Memoir of Bishop Hobart*, 280.

*Binney* (C. T.), *Address on laying the First Stone of the New King's Weigh House*, 177.

*Blunt* (Rev. H. J.), *Discourses on the Trial of the Spirits*, 236.

— (Rev. J. J.) *Hulsean Lectures for 1832*, 235.

*Bond* (C. R.), *Prospectus of the Book of Jasher*, 127.

*Book of the Unveiling*, 236.

*British and Foreign School Society*, *Report of*, 434.

*Bray* (Rev. E. A.), *Visitation Sermon*, 238.

*Bulwer* (E. L.), *England and the English*, 434.

---

*Cattermole* (Rev. R.), *Sermons*, 237.

*Christian Experience as displayed in the Life of St. Paul*, 237.

*Cousin* (V.), *Rapport sur l'Instruction Publique*, 434.

— *Etat de l'Instruction Primaire*, *ib.*

*Crichton* (Andrew), *History of Arabia*, 96.

---

*Daniell* (William), *Oriental Annual*, 239.

*Deliverance from Evil, or Rational Misticism explained*, 236.

*Doctrine of the Trinity deduced*, 235.

*Dworel* (P. J., Esq.), *Paraphrase of the Psalms in Blank Verse*, 153, 154.

---

*Evans* (Rev. E. J.), *Sermons on the Trinity*, 235.

---

*Fanaticism*, 241.

---

*Gipps* (Rev. Henry), *Sermons*, 272.

*Girdlestone* (—), *on the Epistles to the Seven Churches of Asia*, 236.

*Girdlestone* (Rev. Charles), *Church Rates lawful, &c.*, 239.

*Goode* (Rev. Francis), *the Better Covenant*, 237.

*Goode* (Rev. William), *Modern Claims to the Gifts of the Spirit*, 236.

*Grant* (Rev. Johnson), Course of Sermons for the Year, 237.

*Greswell* (Rev. W.), Correspondency between the Mosaic Ritual and the Christian Religion, 412.

*Hardinge* (Rev. Sir C.), Plain Discourses, 237.

*Harrison* (Rev. Thomas), Preparation for Death, 238.

*Holmes* (Rev. W. A.), The Time of the End, 236.

*Hone*, (Rev. T. B.), Lives of Eminent Christians, 162.

*Horne* (Thomas Hartwell) Bibliographical Notes on the Book of Jasher, 127.

*James* (Rev. J. B.), Remarks on Party Distinctions in Religion, 272.

*Jasher*, the Book of, 127.

*Kebel* (Rev. John), National Apostacy, 238.

*Lyell* (Charles). Principles of Geology, 334.

*Meek* (Rev. Robert), On the Errors of the Church of Rome, 235.

*Melvill* (Rev. Henry), Sermons, 191.

*Musgrave* (Rev. George), Book of Psalms in Blank Verse, 153.

*National Society*, Report of, 434.

*Newman* (Rev. J. H.), The Arians of the Fourth Century, 234.

*Nolan* (Rev. F. LL.D.), Bampton Lectures, 233, 411.

*Onderdonk* (Right Rev. H. W., DD.), The Rule of Faith: a Charge, 240.

*Pearson* (Rev. Dr. Hugh), Memoir of C. F. Schwartz, 363.

*Phillpotts* (Right Rev. Henry D.D. Bishop of Exeter), Charge, 238.

*Poor-Laws*, Extracts from Information on the Administration and Operation of, 209.

*Powell* (Rev. Baden), Revelation and Science, 233, 411.

——— Natural Philosophy, 411.

*Protestant Episcopal Church*, Journal of the Proceedings of the General Convention of, 280.

*Second Thoughts* of an Irish Gentleman in search of a Religion, 235.

*Shepherd* (Rev. W.), Sermons, 237.

*Skinner* (Right Rev. Dr.), Charge, 230.

*Stuart* (Rev. Moses), Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, 240.

*Sunday School Union*, Report of, 434.

*Tayler* (Rev. C. B.), Social Evils and their Remedy, 239.

*Taylor*, (Rev. J. J.), Sermon, 434.

*Thoresby* (Ralph), Diary of, and Letters to, 393.

*Unitarian Christianity* demonstrated, 235.

*Waddington* (Rev. George), History of the Church, 1.

*Wall* (Wm. Ellis), Christ Crucified: an Epic Poem, 39.

*Wardlaw* (Ralph, D.D.), Christian Ethics, 313.

*Wigram* (Rev. J. C.), and others, Works for the Promotion of Sunday Schools, 434.

*Wilmot* (R. A.), Lives of Sacred Poets, 239.



# CONTENTS

OF

Nº. XXIX.

---

	PAGE.
ART. I. Library of Useful Knowledge. A History of the Church, from the earliest Ages to the Reformation. By the Rev. George Waddington, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Prebendary of Ferring, in the Cathedral Church of Chichester. . . . .	1
II. Christ Crucified; an Epic Poem, in Twelve Books. By William Ellis Wall, M.A., of Trinity College, Oxford .	39
III. Memoirs of the Court of King Charles the First. By Lucy Aikin. . . . .	48
IV. A Practical Exposition of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. By the Rev. Robert Anderson, Perpetual Curate of Trinity Chapel, Brighton. . . . .	85
V. History of Arabia, Ancient and Modern; containing a Description of the Country—an Account of its Inhabitants, Antiquities, Political Condition, and Early Commerce—the Life and Religion of Möhammed—the Conquests, Arts, and Literature of the Saracens—the Caliphs of Damascus, Bagdad, Africa, and Spain—the Civil Government and Religious Ceremonies of the Modern Arabs—Origin and Suppression of the Wahabees—the Institutions, Character, Manners and Customs of the Bedouins; and a Comprehensive View of its Natural History. By Andrew Crichton. Being Part XIII. of the Edinburgh Cabinet Library. . . . .	96

- VI. 1. The Book of Jasher, with Testimonies and Notes, Critical and Historical, explanatory of the Text ; to which is prefixed Various Readings, and a Preliminary Dissertation, proving the authenticity of the work. Translated into English from the Hebrew, by Flaccus Albinus Alcuinus, of Britain, Abbot of Canterbury, who went a Pilgrimage into the Holy Land and Persia, where he discovered this Volume in the City of Gazna.
2. Prospectus.—To be Published by Subscription, The Book of Jasher, with Testimonies and Notes, Critical and Historical, explanatory of the Text, to which is prefixed Various Readings, and a Preliminary Dissertation, proving the authenticity of the work. Translated into Anglo-Saxon from the Hebrew. By Flaccus Albinus Alcuinus, of Britain, Abbot of Canterbury, who went a Pilgrimage into the Holy Land and Persia, where he discovered this Volume, in the City of Gazna. Revised, Corrected and Edited by the Rev. C. R. Bond, formerly of Em. Coll., Cambridge.
3. Bibliographical Notes on the Book of Jasher. By Thomas Hartwell Horne, B.D., of St. John's College, Cambridge ; Rector of the united Parishes of St. Edmund the King, and St. Nicholas Acons, Lombard Street ; Prebendary of St. Paul's ; Author of the " Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures." . . . . . 127
- VII. 1. The Book of the Psalms of David, in English Blank Verse : being a new Poetical Arrangement of the sweet Songs of Israel ; adapted to the use of general Readers, with a View to the more perfect Understanding, and consequent relish and appreciation, of the subject-matter of those Divine Compositions. By the Rev. George Musgrave, A.M. B.N.C.

2. A Paraphrase of the Psalms, executed in Blank Verse : with strict attention to the Notes and Commentaries of Bishops Horsley, Horne, &c. and closely approximated to the Text of the authorised Versions of the Old Testament and the Liturgy. By P. J. Ducarel, Esq.	153
VIII. Lives of Eminent Christians. By the Rev. T. B. Hone.	162
IX. An Address delivered on laying the first Stone of the New King's Weigh-House, a place of worship intended for the use of a Congregational Church. By C. T. Binney. . . . .	177
X. Sermons. By Henry Melvill, M.A., late Fellow and Tutor of St. Peter's College, Cambridge, and Minister of Camden Chapel, Camberwell. . . . .	191
XI. Extracts from the Information received by His Majesty's Commissioners as to the Administration and Operation of the Poor Laws. . . . .	209
<hr/>	
ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD. . . . .	227



THE  
BRITISH CRITIC,  
**Quarterly Theological Review,**  
AND  
ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

---

JANUARY, 1834.

---

ART. I.—*Library of Useful Knowledge. A History of the Church, from the earliest Ages to the Reformation.* By the Rev. George Waddington, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Prebendary of Ferring, in the Cathedral Church of Chichester. Published under the superintendence of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge. London. Baldwin and Cradock. 1833.

WE are exceedingly happy to find that a History of the Church of Christ has been thought worthy of a place among the designs of a Society for the diffusion of *Useful Knowledge*. It is something, at least, to see that an acquaintance with the purposes and dealings of Almighty God, as concerning the destinies of man's immortal spirit, has found sufficient favour with the patrons of intellectual improvement, to be set down upon their catalogue of *useful* things. The Association in question leaves no branch of mere sublunary lore untouched. The laws and combinations of the material Universe—the conflicts of earthly passion—the rise and progress, the decline and fall, of stupendous empires—all these, and other subjects manifold which relate to the secular and transitory interests of man—might reasonably be expected to invite the excursive genius which presides over the deliberations of the Body in question. That they would be prepared to explore the labyrinth of Ecclesiastical Antiquity, however, was not by any means so confidently to be expected. But so it is—and we have here before us the fruits of their comprehensive care, in “*A History of the Church, from the earliest Ages to the time of the Reformation.*”

But if the original announcement of such a design looked well, it looked still better that the individual selected for the office of Historian was a Presbyter of the Church of England. And all who were anxious for the literary honour of the Church of England, could not be otherwise than highly gratified, on finding that

the choice had fallen on a person of Mr. Waddington's eminent reputation. Mr. Waddington is well known to the world as an enterprising traveller, and a profound scholar; as a man splendidly distinguished for the energy of his mind, and the variety of his acquirements. His very name is sufficient to satisfy us, that the business would be undertaken and executed with unflinching integrity and courage; that the stores of sacred learning would be investigated with unwearied industry; and that the result would be an intrepid exhibition of those views, whatever they might be, which should unfold themselves to his perception in the course of his researches.

Taking it as a whole, his performance has certainly not disappointed us. It is, unquestionably, an extraordinary work;—a *very* extraordinary work, when we recollect that the composition of it cannot well have occupied more than five or six years. The toil of consulting such a vast mass of writings, and of producing, in so short a period, a condensed, interesting, and perspicuous recital, from these enormous materials,—must have been immense. In truth, the Ecclesiastical History of 1500 years is a task by no means too great for nearly the whole life of any individual. And even if any individual had a whole life to devote to it, it would demand all his energies of thought, and all his powers of application; and these directed by a constant sense of the necessity of guidance from above. It really does appear to us that if such a work were demanded within a limited time, it could be fitly executed in no other way than that which was adopted by King James's translators of the Bible. Certain portions of it should be assigned to different persons respectively, all of them eminently gifted for the office; and each portion should be subjected to careful examination and revision by the whole body. In the present instance, however, the undivided labour has been thrown upon one man; and this one man has been required to complete his gigantic task, within a period suitable to the designs of the Society which employed him. And it is no more than justice to say, that there are probably very few men living who could, within that period, have fulfilled the engagement, as it has been fulfilled by Mr. Waddington. We have no doubt that the volume before us will not only maintain his renown for ability and learning, but very signally advance it. Most assuredly it must secure him an honourable place among the masters of historical narration. His style is, throughout, remarkable for its freedom and its vigour. He has much of that philosophical sagacity which is among the highest attributes of an historian. And the result has been, that, although his work can hardly be considered as more than an abridgment, it is yet



not chargeable with the dryness and the saplessness which usually give an evil name to that meagre species of compilation.

It would be altogether a vain thing to attempt a complete analysis or profound examination of a work like this, within the limits of a Critical Essay. We must, accordingly, content ourselves with such scattered notices as may suit the limits of our space. And, in the first place, we have to remark, with decided approbation, the arrangement of his materials, adopted by Mr. Waddington. "I have," he says, "abandoned the method of division by centuries, which has too long perplexed Ecclesiastical History; and have endeavoured to regulate the partition by the dependence of connected events, and by the momentous revolutions which have arisen from it. It is one advantage of this plan, that it has frequently enabled me to collect under one head, to digest by a single effort, and present in one uninterrupted view, materials bearing in reality upon the same point; but which, by the more usual method, are separated and distracted." Undoubtedly it would be very difficult to assign any intelligible reason why the History of the Church, any more than the History of States, should be cut up into portions, equal to each other in nothing but length of time. If the sudden disruption of a connected series of events is an intolerable inconvenience in the one case, it must be an equally intolerable inconvenience in the other.

But to come to matters of more vital importance;—the next thing which solicits our notice, in the performance of Mr. Waddington, is, the peculiar type and character of his Church principles. It seems tolerably evident to us, that he belongs to that class, which is generally known by the name of moderate or liberal Churchmen. And, when we speak of liberal Churchmen, we wish not to be understood as using this phrase in any offensive acceptation; most certainly in no acceptation which can imply any question of the author's historical integrity. If Mr. Waddington is a liberal Churchman, we presume that he is so, because the views of liberal Churchmanship are those which he deliberately and conscientiously approves, as most in harmony with the spirit and the principles of the religion of which he is a minister. It so happens, however, that *we* belong to the class which is pretty generally known by the title of Illiberal Churchmen. And we hold it right to make this avowal in the outset of our remarks, albeit we have before our eyes a somewhat formidable denunciation of the folly inherent in that unpopular class. "It has *generally*," says Mr. Waddington, in his account of the Great Schism, "been the error of *High Churchmen*, to advance the loftiest pretensions at the most unseasonable moments; and, instead of receding at a crisis of violence and danger, to rush, *with a sort of*

*effeminate rashness*, into perils which would not otherwise have reached them." (p. 536.) Truly, these be ominous and alarming syllables! But alas! our temerity is incorrigible. We protest that, even in these threatening times, we have no thought of *receding* from the ground, which, according to our judgment and belief, it is our duty to occupy and to maintain. And we trust that Mr. Waddington will freely forgive us for this honest declaration. For we never can believe that his liberality has any alliance whatever with that spirit of one-sided *reciprocity*, which is sometimes found to disfigure the symmetry of liberal principles. The freedom which he claims for himself, he will, both cheerfully and generously, be ready to concede to others.

In order to verify our surmises respecting the complexion of Mr. Waddington's ecclesiastical views, we would advert to his notions on the subject of Church Government. That, in one sense, and to a certain extent, he is a conscientious *Episcopalian*, there can be no doubt. It is clear that he considers the Episcopal regimen as by no means in opposition to the will of God. It is, further, clear that he regards it as the mode of government of all others the best fitted for the purpose of consolidating the strength, and securing the stability, of the Church. But then, it is, we think, almost equally clear, that he does *not* consider the Episcopal Constitution as the only safe and legitimate constitution of Christian societies. If he were to be entrusted with the formation of a new Christian community, he would, we question not, sincerely and ardently recommend that its spiritual affairs should be placed under the direction of Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons. But this recommendation—unless we grievously mistake him—would be prompted, not so much by a conviction that Episcopacy was a Divine, or, at least, an Apostolical Institution, as by a persuasion that it would be exceedingly rash and injudicious to make trial of any other. We, on the contrary, if placed in a similar situation, should lament and resist any departure from the primitive form of government, not merely as an abandonment of the wisdom of antiquity, but as an exceedingly dangerous, if not positively heretical, violation of the original Apostolic discipline. In so doing, we might probably put into violent commotion whatever elements of liberalism might happen to be lurking in our infant colony. But still, we trust that, although we might not be able to reckon on the support of Mr. Waddington to the full extent of our own persuasions, *he* would be far from joining in the violent outcry against the narrowness and bigotry of our prejudices.

An instance, in illustration of *his own* notions respecting the primitive government of the Church, occurs very early in his

work. He appears to consider it as *beyond all question* that the Episcopal form was not established at Corinth in the year 95 of the Christian æra. (p. 12.) Now, if he is right in this persuasion, it is obvious that a considerable breach will have been effected in the argument, by which it is contended that Episcopacy is essential to the formation of a Christian Church. The adversaries of Episcopacy have been often challenged to produce an instance of any one Church, since the time of the Apostles, which has been regulated by any but Episcopal discipline. And this challenge has now been answered by Mr. Waddington. The Church of Corinth, he tell us, was not ordered by Episcopal discipline, at a period distant by nearly one hundred years from the birth of Christ. He does not speak of it as a doubtful matter. He does not content himself with saying that it is impossible to prove that bishops *were* then fixed in the diocese, or the province, of Corinth. His words are,—“the Episcopal form of government was *clearly not yet here established*.” As this is a question of no ordinary importance, Mr. Waddington, we are sure, will pardon us for devoting some sentences to the examination of it.\*

The occasion which calls forth this assertion from Mr. Waddington was as follows: the Christians of Corinth seemed to have retained their factious and turbulent habits, even after their conversion to the faith of the Gospel. It is well known that their dissensions required the controlling hand of St. Paul. And it further appears that, towards the end of the first century—(though the date of the occurrence has been much disputed)—the spirit of sedition again broke out among them, and manifested itself in the deposition of certain of their ministers. This violent proceeding was of course attended by much confusion in the Church; and a deputation was, in consequence, despatched to Clemens, Bishop of Rome, probably to solicit his friendly mediation. The application was kindly entertained by the bishop, and produced his celebrated Epistle to the Corinthians.

Upon this transaction the following are the remarks of our historian. We should here observe—he says—that the Epistle is written in the name of the Church sojourning at Rome, not in that of a Roman bishop; that its character is of exhortation, not of authority; and that it is in answer to a communication originally made by the Church of Corinth. And then immediately follows the confident assertion, that “the Episcopal form of government *was clearly not yet here established*.” We know not

\* This point has already been discussed, with eminent learning and ability, by a writer in a contemporary journal, the *British Magazine* for Sept. 1833, p. 299—308. We, nevertheless, do not feel ourselves absolved from the duty of offering some remarks upon it here.

whether Mr. Waddington ventures on this assertion as an obvious and irresistible inference from his own statement, which immediately precedes it. If he does—we can only say, on our parts, that we are utterly at a loss to imagine how the premises and the conclusion were brought together. Here is an Epistle addressed by the Church at Rome to the Church at Corinth, without any mention of a bishop of either place, upon the face of its title. If, then, we are to conclude from this, that there was, at that period, no bishop at Corinth, we might just as reasonably conclude that there was no bishop at Rome. Such a conclusion, however, we happen to know, would be false with respect to Rome. Why then is the same conclusion to be admitted as indisputable with respect to Corinth? Neither can we perceive any thing in the admonitory tone of the address which points to any inference either one way or the other. Whether a bishop were at Corinth, or not,—in what other language, but that of friendly exhortation, would a Bishop of Rome express himself, in those primitive days, to the Christians of another Church? The Bishop of Rome, at that time, neither exercised nor claimed authority over any other community. His interference, therefore, whether requested by the Corinthians or not, would naturally come in the form of brotherly mediation, rather than that of official superiority.

But then—Mr. Waddington adds—the Episcopal form of government was probably “adverse to the republican spirit of Greece.” And yet—even if this were so—it is a marvellous thing that Corinth should be the only instance that can be produced, in which the republican spirit arrayed itself, from the very first, against the establishment of Episcopacy. Equally strange is it that, having once resisted the establishment of Episcopacy, it should afterwards endure the introduction of that regimen. The matter may be stated thus: either the Episcopal form was, at least, of Apostolic institution, or it was not. If it was, it is scarcely credible that even “the republican spirit of Greece” should have been strong enough to prevail against it in Apostolic times. If it was not,—if forms of Church government were, from the beginning, mere matters of indifference—what should we expect, but that ecclesiastical polity would flexibly accommodate itself to all the varieties of local and civil polity throughout the world? And yet the Church of Corinth is the one, solitary Church, respecting which alone Mr. Waddington can venture to pronounce, that the government of bishops was *not* established there, towards the close of the first century.\*

\* In p. 200, indeed, Mr. Waddington speaks of “one or two exceptions;” but he does not specify the *second*.

In fact, the utmost that can possibly be said, respecting the case of Corinth, is, that we are not in possession of any recorded proof that this Church was, at that period, under the government of bishops. At all events Mr. Waddington assuredly has produced nothing which can entitle him to assume it as *clear* that episcopacy was *not* established there. If, however, we are to come to mere presumptions, we may very confidently aver that all the presumptions are decidedly adverse to the conclusion of Mr. Waddington. It is distinctly acknowledged by himself (note, p. 23,) that the power of ordination was derived from the Apostles, and was at no time claimed by any order inferior to that of bishops. And if this be so, it is scarcely conceivable that the church of Corinth should remain so long without that class of ministers, whose function was necessary for so important a purpose. All those Churches, the history of which has been distinctly preserved to us, are known to have been under the direction of such ministers. Not a single Church, whether great or small, has ever been named, of which history informs us in positive terms, that it ever was subjected to any other government. And, when, in addition to this, we find it expressly affirmed in the 44th section of the epistle of St. Clement, that the ministerial succession was ordained by the Apostles themselves,—what is the *presumption*; but that this succession was maintained at Corinth, precisely in the same manner as it was maintained in every other Church, of which any detailed account has been preserved. Nay, it does appear to us that something more than presumption may be raised out of the very words of St. Clement, in the opening of his epistles, where he commends the Corinthians for the spirit of obedience for which they were distinguished, previously to the late unhappy commotions. “Ye walked,” he says, “according to the laws of God, being subject to your supreme rulers, and yielding due honour to the Elders, or Presbyters, among you.”\* Now the word ἡγούμενοι, here translated Supreme Rulers, answers very accurately to the English word *Prelate*; or to the Latin word *Præpositus*, which is applied by Cyprian to the Apostles themselves. And since St. Clement is here speaking of obedience, not in civil but ecclesiastical matters, the inevitable inference seems to be, that bishops were in his contemplation when he used this expression.

We are of course aware, that the offence of the seditious Corinthians was the expulsion of certain of their Presbyters. But Mr. Waddington cannot imagine that this circumstance is suffi-

\* Ὑποτάσσόμενοι τοῖς ἡγουμένοις ὑμῶν, καὶ τιμὴν τὴν καὶ δέουσαν ἀποτίμουσι τοῖς παρ' ὑμῶν πρεσβυτέροις.—Clem. Ep. Cor. s. 1.

cient to make it *clear*, that there were no Bishops in the Churches of Achaia which formed the Corinthian province. How can we be sure that these Presbyters (if not themselves Bishops) were **not** ejected by the people, in a fit of opposition to Episcopal authority? Such an outrage would be very much in character among the contumacious republicans of Greece. And if it should be said, that all this is but conjecture, our reply is, that it is conjecture supported by a vast body of overpowering presumption, derived from other sources; whereas the *clear* fact alleged by Mr. Waddington turns out, after all, to be nothing more than conjecture, not only unsupported by presumption, but in direct opposition to it.

We cannot quit this subject without remarking that, in p. 209, we find it intimated, that, "in the various conditions of Apostolical Christianity, the scattered elements of some forms of government and discipline may be observed, which, though they were very early *absorbed* by the Episcopal system, should not be passed over in silence; since they are still pleaded as precedents, and imitated as models, by many excellent Christians." Now, without any disposition to dispute the excellence of the Christians in question, we cannot but think it passing strange, that they should be able to contemplate, without some misgivings, this early and general process of *absorption*. If their own forms of government be right and scriptural, this early *absorption* must have been no less than one rapid, wide-spread, and unanimous abuse. With such persons, therefore, the case will stand thus:—They "plead as precedents, and they imitate as models," certain forms of government, of which there are various scattered notices in the history of Apostolical Christianity. But nevertheless it does so happen that all these alleged primitive institutions are little better than still-born. At most, they pass away like an untimely birth. They come to no maturity. They maintain a brief and sickly existence. They are then heard of no more. They are thrust aside, and consigned to oblivion, by a more vigorous and enterprising competitor for the birth-right. But, nevertheless, they rise again, after fifteen hundred years, to push the dominant hierarchy from their stools! There is something, we repeat, so utterly astounding in the notion of this precipitate and general defection from the aboriginal discipline,—this sudden loss and disappearance of primitive and venerated "models,"—and this potent *absorption*, by which they were all engulfed in the *rapids* of a different system,—that we really are scarcely able to image to ourselves the state of that mind which can endure the violence offered to it by so enormous an hypothesis.



After all, however, what are these pure forms of Ecclesiastical discipline, which float in the morning light of Apostolical Christianity? Surely not that form which towers into independence of all Apostolical succession whatever! For if we were to maintain this, we should be put to instant rebuke by the express language of the Apostolic father, St. Clement, who asserts, in the 44th section of his Epistle, that "the Apostles well knew, from the Lord Jesus himself, that strife would ensue respecting the name or dignity of the Superintendency (ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι τῆς Ἐπισκοπῆς); and having such perfect foreknowledge, they, for this cause, ordained the above-mentioned (viz. ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους); and next established a rule (ἐπινομήν), that when these should die, other approved men should succeed to their ministry." If, however, it be contended that the elements of the Presbyterian system, as exclusive of Episcopacy, are to be found in the primitive government of the Church, we can do no more, in these pages, than appeal to the writings of those who have faithfully and, as it appears to us, victoriously, combated that notion. In the mean time, however, with all our respect for Mr. Waddington, we must protest, most vehemently, against his concession to our adversaries, that the Church of Corinth was *clearly* a Presbyterian Church, in the time of St. Clement, the Apostolic Bishop of Rome.

We cannot forbear, in this place, to intimate our suspicions, that the enemies of the Episcopal regimen are in the habits of most egregiously mistaking its genuine character; and that this mistake disposes many among them to a favourable estimate of the project for re-collecting "the scattered elements of other forms of government," from the depths of Christian antiquity, and framing them into a system more propitious to the happiness and the freedom of mankind. Neither can we affect to be ignorant that the very Society, which have done themselves honour by selecting Mr. Waddington as their historian of the Church, are by no means supposed to be wholly exempt from the prejudice in question. We apprehend, at least, that there are individuals in that Body, who are very apt, in their own minds, to connect the cause of Episcopacy with that of tyranny; and, on the other hand, to associate the establishment of a more level platform with images of mental improvement and emancipation. Now, we conceive that it would signally aid "the diffusion of *useful* knowledge," to disabuse them of this most unjust and erroneous impression. And we do verily believe that few men are, in fact, better able to disabuse them than Mr. Waddington. He is, we have not the slightest doubt, an ardent lover of his country, and an inflexible friend to the cause of civil and religious liberty

throughout the world. But then, he must know very well, that there is nothing whatever in the original institution of Episcopacy, which frowns upon the civil and religious liberties of man. He can tell the patrons of "useful knowledge" that the authority of a Bishop is not the authority of a despot—not the authority of a *Lord over the heritage*. Neither is the obedience of the clergy to their spiritual rulers, the slavish submission of men who hold a delegated trust at the caprice and discretion of their superior. The power of a Bishop is rather that of paternal influence than of lordly domination. And the obedience of the Presbyter is a duty rendered by him, not to the persons and the countenances of men, but to the holy Apostolic college, whose authority still lives in the persons of the successors of the Apostles. And if it should so happen, at any time, that the Bishops of a Protestant Church should forget the moderation which becomes their calling;—if they should attempt to violate the privileges of the inferior order;—in what quarter should we look for the most resolute and manful resistance to the usurpation? Most undoubtedly we should look for it among the highest Churchmen;—most undoubtedly we should look for it among those who are most profoundly conversant with the monuments and the practices of Christian antiquity. All this must, doubtless, be well known to Mr. Waddington. He himself reminds us that St. Cyprian, whose notions of Episcopal dignity were in some respects sufficiently exalted, was nevertheless accustomed, on almost every possible occasion, to consult his Presbyters before he acted. Circumstances, too various to be considered here, may have gradually led to a discontinuance of this practice, in more modern times. But who can ever imagine that any learned or enlightened Presbyter of the Church of England would object to its revival, if circumstances were to render it practicable or convenient? We trust that Mr. Waddington will agree with us that nothing can be more ridiculous than the vulgar notion, that an Episcopal Church is necessarily a school of servility. The *true* Churchman will stand up for the Presbyterate, as sturdily as for the Episcopate. No person, therefore, is less likely than he, to imbibe any abject prejudices in favour of arbitrary power.

We are confirmed in our hope that Mr. Waddington's sentiments, relative to this matter, are essentially in harmony with our own, by his distinct testimony to that spirit of freedom which breathed through the religion of Christ, under the administration of the primitive Episcopal Church. His words are these:—

"It is true that, in becoming acquainted with the strength of Christianity, he (the Emperor Constantine,) also discovered its virtues. In the excellence of the Christian system he perceived a great omen of its

perpetuity. He saw too, that as a rule for civilized society, it was more efficient than any human law, because more powerful in its motives to obedience. And perhaps he remarked also that the energy of Christians had hitherto been confined to submission and endurance; to unoffending, unresisting perseverance. And this outward display of loyalty might lead him to overlook that *free spirit* which pervaded both the principles of the religion and the government of the Church; and which, in later ages, was so commonly found in opposition to despotism."—pp. 80, 81.

Once more—

"It was immediately after this event" (the restoration of Athanasius to the episcopal throne of Alexandria, in the year 349,) "that Constantius succeeded to the Western Empire; and in his zeal for the propagation of Arianism he presently renewed his attacks on Athanasius. He summoned Councils of the Western Bishops; he menaced and caressed and corrupted the Bishops whom he had summoned, and at length (in the year 356) with great difficulty succeeded in deposing for the third time his spiritual adversary.

"This struggle must not be past over with slight notice, since it presents to us an event, of which there had yet been no experience in the history of the Church, or in the history of Rome, or perhaps in the history of man. Hitherto, at least till a very short time previous, the Church had been a despised and seemingly defenceless community, subject, as a Body, to the capricious insults of every tyrant, and liable, in its individual members, to his arbitrary inflictions. Until very lately, the Emperor of the Roman world possessed authority uncontrolled over the liberty and life of his subjects, undisputed by any, except as rebels, or rivals for the throne. And certainly the monstrous evils of despotic government have never been more signally displayed, than during the dreary interval which separated Augustus and Constantine. Still at the end of that period the rules of government remained the same as at the beginning—no civil revolution had assigned limits to the authority of the Prince, or introduced any counteracting power—no political change had given weight to popular opinion or honour to free principles. And yet scarcely forty years from the accession of Constantine had elapsed, when we behold his son and successor reduced to the employment of intrigue and artifice, for the deposition of a magistrate whom he detested. The singularity of this circumstance is even increased by two other considerations—one of which is, that the Emperor had the cordial support of a considerable portion of his subjects, the Arian party, in this contest—and the other, that his adversary was not sustained by any armed force of soldiers or followers; nor is it probable even that his violent execution would have been followed by any serious insurrection. Yet Constantius, with a prudent respect both for the spiritual authority of the Bishop and the rights of the Church, proceeded to the accomplishment of his object by indirect and tedious and unworthy methods. Such circumstances become indeed familiar to us in the pages of later history; but we should not for that reason overlook their first occurrence, nor fail to record with pleasure and gratitude the earliest proof we possess of the

*political effect of Christianity in moderating the despotism with which it was associated.*"—pp. 96, 97.

Here we have another candid and most honourable testimony to the "*free spirit* which pervaded the Christian system;" and this, too, at a time when episcopal government had been universal throughout Christendom for three centuries. In after days, indeed, Episcopacy became a much more imperious and lordly thing than it was during the Ante-Nicene period, and even for a considerable time subsequently to that period. But we are not contending for this, or for any other of the manifold abuses and corruptions, which, in the course of ages, gathered round the Church. We are contending, purely, for the honour of genuine paternal Episcopacy. We are contending for it, as it has existed, and as it always may exist,—whether in its original and unendowed simplicity; or whether it lift its mitred head in the palaces of kings. It is true that wealth, and grandeur, and ample jurisdiction, *may*, in the lapse of time, become almost fatally injurious to that spirit of moderation, which ought to distinguish the rulers of a spiritual kingdom; so that, at length, an unbecoming loftiness of expression may steal over the features of the Christian prelacy; and tempt the ignorant to believe that the fathers of the church are, by their very calling, no better than the associates and the assessors of tyranny. But this is a gross and sweeping misconception, which nothing can more effectually dissipate than a profound acquaintance with the annals of the church. With all its perversions and corruptions, the episcopal church of Christ, as Mr. Waddington asserts, has been very commonly the adversary of despotism. And we may confidently add that, in proportion to its purity, the church will ever be the adversary of despotism;—whether the despotism be manifested in the person of an individual tyrant; or whether it appear in the shape of a certain ferocious monster, with a multitude of heads.

If we have dwelt longer upon this point than we first intended, our excuse must be found in the truly momentous nature of the question. We now proceed to other matters. In his fourth chapter Mr. Waddington considers the persecutions inflicted on Christianity by several of the Roman emperors. And he very properly begins by demolishing the insidious and contemptible absurdities which have been often vented, respecting the indulgent character of the classic polytheism. Indulgent enough, in one sense, that system unquestionably was. Where the standing army of divinities amounted to somewhere about thirty thousand, it is not to be supposed that a few supernumeraries would ever be regarded as a matter of much consequence. But yet—woe to that individual who should presume to augment, or to diminish,

the muster-roll, by a single name, without the formal sanction of the magistracy!

“The intrusion of one stranger,” says Mr. Waddington, “would scarcely be noticed in the numerous synod of Mount Olympus. The golden portals were ever open. Useful virtue, or splendid vice, gave an equal claim to admission. The policy or servility of Rome bowed, with the same pliancy, to the captive gods of her enemies, or the manes of her imperial tyrants. This was not a virtue, but a *part*, of Polytheism. The new deities became new members of the same monstrous body. They assisted and sustained each other: and the whole mass was held together by ignorance, and animated by the gross spirit of superstition. It seems, indeed, that a pagan statesman, who may have permitted additions to the calendar of his gods, deserves no higher description of praise, than that which we should bestow on a pope, who has been zealous in the canonization of saints. For one idol will presently become as holy as another idol. Nor could any reason be given why Jove should scorn the society of Serapis, since their respective divinity was founded on the same evidence, and their worship conducted on the same principles.”

This is a brief, but admirable and masterly statement of the whole matter. “The golden portals were ever open.” But then comes the question,—were there no warders stationed at the “golden portals?” Open as they were, we are not to imagine that every individual was at liberty to introduce his god. No new divinity could gain admittance, without a ticket from the prætor or the ædile, the senate or the emperor. And when once admitted, he was allowed only to take his seat, quietly and sociably, among the vast populace of celestial tenants already in possession. He was not permitted to question the title, or disturb the repose, of any other occupant. In other words, all right of *private judgment* in matters of religion was utterly unknown in classic and pagan Rome. It is true that “the influx of idolaters, from every nation under heaven, made it difficult to preserve the purity (purity!) of the Roman religion.” But what then? The Roman religion contrived still to preserve its own supremacy, and even to strengthen its Roman character, “by the successive and easy deification of the most vicious of mankind.” This deification, however, was not the work of individual caprice or superstition. The establishment of gods was regulated by the same power as that which ordered the enrolment of legions!

In the midst of this state of things, a religion arises, which abjures all society with the rabblement of the pagan calendar: a religion which removed its votaries from the national altars, on pain of all the consequences due to impiety and apostacy: a religion which wielded no carnal weapons, indeed, for its own establishment or propagation; but which carried on a sort of

peaceful warfare against the dominant superstitions, by the spiritual implements of argument, of exhortation, and of entreaty. A faith like this wore the aspect of downright atheism in the eyes of the vulgar,—of audacious treason, in the estimation of the magistrate. To neglect the deities of the state, was to insult the established religion—to violate the law—and to defy the supreme authority of the republic or the empire. A man was no more at liberty to trifle with the ordinances relative to public worship and festivity, than he was at liberty to resist a decree of the senate, or a rescript of the sovereign, or to neglect any other duty of a citizen or a subject. And, under such circumstances as these, the profession of the Cross may almost be said to have fixed upon the Nazarenes the stamp of rebellion and of outlawry. Every Christian may almost be considered, at that period, as wearing what our law calls the *caput lupinum*. He was an object of contempt and outrage to the pagan multitude; and a victim of persecution, when the hand of the pagan ruler was stretched forth to vindicate the insulted majesty of Rome.

To talk, therefore, of the tolerance of the ancient Polytheism, is to talk of the tolerance which allows a man to keep one set of religious opinions for his private use, if he will but profess another set of opinions in public; or rather, if he will but virtually declare to the world, that he has no opinions at all, but is content to follow the customs of his ancestors. Undoubtedly, the Christians would have been as much at liberty to believe in their “crucified malefactor,” as the philosophers were at liberty to believe in no God whatever, if they would but have submitted to the same conditions as the philosophers; if they could but have purchased victims, and burned incense, and joined the idolatrous crowds before the altars and the temples. In other words, they might have been amply *tolerated*, if they would but have shown themselves ashamed of the Son of Man before the face of a sinful and adulterous generation. This sort of toleration was, of course, considered by the followers of Christ as nothing better than an invitation to apostacy: and the consequence was, that they were insulted, plundered, and massacred by the populace; and tossed to the lions, or cast into the flames, by the arm of imperial power.

We must here present our readers with some admirable reflections of Mr. Waddington, on the character and principles of the most philosophical and systematic of all the imperial persecutors:

“Marcus Antoninus undertook the task of ‘punishment’ or persecution among the earliest of his imperial duties, and he continued to fulfil it with unremitting diligence throughout the nineteen years of his



splendid administration. He acted on deliberate principles, and his principles were not of partial or local operation, but were equally applicable to every province of his empire. And thus he everywhere enforced the laws in their full severity; the lives and the property of the convicted were forfeited by the most summary process of justice; and the search which was made after the suspected, and which the uninformed humanity of Trajan had so nobly discouraged, sufficiently proves the activity of the pursuit and the earnestness of the pursuer. But the most important point of distinction is probably this: Marcus Antoninus knew much better the nature of the evil which he was committing: he was acquainted, to a certain extent, at least, with the opinions of the Christians, and the innocence of their character; and it is not likely that he had entirely neglected to examine the grounds of their faith. He watched the process of his own inflictions, and when he perceived the fortitude with which all endured, and the eagerness with which many courted them, he coldly reprov'd the unphilosophic enthusiasm of the martyrs. And yet, perhaps, his own philosophy was not quite devoid of enthusiasm, or, at least, it was not strictly regulated by reason, when it led him to labour for the destruction of the most moral and loyal portion of his subjects, only because they disclaimed the very superstitions which he placed his pride in despising. Nor again was his practice consistent with his professed contempt of these: for it is said, and seemingly on good foundation, that Marcus Antoninus was frequent in consultation with the Chaldæan sages, deeply conversant with the mysteries of astrology, credulously attentive to oracular prophecy, obedient to the premonitions of dreams, which he believed to descend from Heaven—assertions not incredible, nor inconsistent with his studies or his principles; and there is ground to hesitate whether we should not rather convict him of superstition than hypocrisy. But it is certain that his understanding was of the broadest and most comprehensive description; that it was enlightened by every worldly knowledge, and fortified by frequent meditation; that his character was founded in excellent dispositions, confirmed by the best principles which were known to the Pagan world. His general regard for justice has never been questioned; even his humanity is commonly celebrated; and if the representations of history be not exaggerated, he reached as high a degree both of wisdom and of moral excellence as is attainable by the unassisted faculties of man—and yet this prince polluted every year of a long reign with innocent blood.

“In our natural anxiety to honour every form of human excellence, we search for his excuse in the religious policy so long established in the empire. But we find that those of his predecessors, who were disposed to soften or suspend its operation upon Christians, possessed the power to do so; and we cannot doubt that the despotic authority of Marcus would have enabled him to revise or repeal those oppressive statutes, if he had learnt from the books of his philosophers the virtue or the meaning of Toleration. This, indeed, is the real and only ground of his defence; and we shall regard his conduct with less indignation, if we reflect how feeble were the mightiest principles of conduct with which

he was acquainted; on what a loose and shifting foundation they rested; how large was the class of virtues which they did not comprehend, and how imperfect were the motives which they proposed for the practice of any. And thus considered, we shall discover, perhaps, some trace of heavenly providence in the circumstance, that the imperial philosopher, flourishing in the maturity of his science, and deficient in nothing which nature or man could bestow, was armed with the highest temporal authority and permitted to direct it against the *infancy* of our faith. From the splendid imperfection of Marcus Antoninus, from the perseverance of his powerful enmity, from its final failure, we may learn what narrow limits have been assigned to the virtue and wisdom and power of unassisted man; and we derive a new motive of gratitude for that heavenly aid, which has fixed our social happiness on a certain and eternal foundation."-- pp. 47—49.

Aye—this is, indeed, a most overpowering exhibition of the heaven-descended might of the Everlasting Gospel! Here was all the power, all the wisdom, all the virtue (such as it was)—that could, by possibility, be concentrated in the person of one heathen man,—directed, for a series of years, against the truth of God: and this too, not in fitful bursts of angry despotism, but with sustained, deliberate, unimpassioned steadiness. And what was all this—but the beating of the daily tide against the imperishable Rock?

The persecution of Diocletian was so atrociously severe, that the heathens flattered themselves that the extirpation of Christianity had been, at last, accomplished. And, to the eternal disgrace of *man's wisdom*, the foremost instigators of that persecution were the philosophers;—the philosophers who, (as Mr. Waddington observes,) were perpetually lavishing all the resources of their sagacity and wit in exposing the multiform absurdities of polytheism;—the philosophers, of whom Tertullian exclaimed, *quinimò et Deos vestros palàm destruunt,—laudantibus vobis!* Well may the church of God be likened to an anvil, on which hammers of every form, and material, and weight, are sure to be broken in the end. The work was plied for three whole centuries, sometimes by monsters of vice, sometimes by prodigies of *wisdom*, and of *virtue*. Characters of every description, "from the highest moral and intellectual excellence, down to the lowest imaginable turpitude," took counsel together against the Lord and against his Anointed: and the Lord had them in derision.

Upon the controversy, relative to the number of the Martyrs, Mr. Waddington has, judiciously enough, bestowed only a single note. One cause of exaggeration, he observes, may have been, that the term *martyr* (witness) was, in the early church,

indiscriminately extended to all, whose religion had exposed them to *any* infliction; such as loss of property or liberty; a class of sufferers now usually called *confessors*. The question is of no great importance. Let the *extenuators* have it their own way. Let the glory of *martyrdom* be refused to all, except those who perished by famine, or by fire, or by the sword. That the number of *sufferers* was frightfully great, must still remain indisputable; unless we are to consider insult, and destitution, and captivity, as light afflictions: to say nothing of that *daily death* inflicted by the incessant terror of impending outrage. In one sense, it may be affirmed, that the church, collectively, was in a state of perpetual martyrdom for three hundred years: for, during that period, the church bore witness to the truth, in the midst of continued peril. She trod, at every step, over secret fires, which frequently burst forth to torment, though not consume her. But, when we meditate upon this subject, never let us forget the perfidious inconsistency of Gibbon. In order to reduce the amount of Diocletian's victims, he applies the trifling portion who perished in Palestine, as a probable measure of the numbers who suffered in other provinces of the Roman Empire. "In other places," says Mr. Waddington, "he is forward enough to acknowledge the narrow limits, and to extenuate the population of Palestine." But, nevertheless, when it suits his insidious purpose, he can resort to Palestine as a test of transactions which took place throughout a large portion of the globe: and this he could do, although "he was not ignorant, that even the proportion of Christians in that country was less than that in any other province!"

The 7th chapter is devoted to the Arian Controversy. And here, as elsewhere, the pen of Mr. Waddington marches with its usual freedom and power. For ourselves, we can scarcely forbear to regret that it has not taken something of a wider range through this awful and interesting region. The Arian heresy, indeed, is now pretty well consigned to the place of forgotten things. But it was a tremendous phenomenon in its time: one of the most awful that ever arose to afflict and dismay the church. Its appearance has always been reckoned among the critical and fiery trials of Christianity. And there is one peculiarity of it, which must always render its history singularly and fearfully instructive, namely, that it was covered over, if not with names of blasphemy, at least with the most glaring marks of human arrogance and self-sufficiency. Nothing is better known, respecting the masters of the Arian school, than their habitual and almost unlimited reliance on their own powers of reasoning,

and their utter disregard of ancient and primitive authority. Another remarkable characteristic of it was, that Arianism was a monster with many horns; and that those horns had the convenient faculty of sprouting up, successively, as the exigencies and dangers of the season seemed to require; so that, if one were cut away, another was ready to spring up in its place. Every one must be aware, that the orthodox of that period complained, that no capricious testator ever altered his will so often and so suddenly as the Arians altered their creed. How many different schemes of belief were ever put forth by this pertinacious and multiform heresy, it might be difficult to say. It is certain, however, that they were sufficient in number to exemplify the prodigious versatility of error, and to display that activity of evolution of which the human mind is capable, when closely pressed by the pursuit of truth. It, therefore, appears to us, that a somewhat more ample exposition of this subject might have furnished an advantageous field for the powers of Mr. Waddington, without trespassing very formidably upon the limits of his design.

We can sympathise very cordially with him, in thinking that it would have been a signal mercy to the church, if she could have been spared the misery and distraction incident to this controversy. According to the shallow judgments of our poor humanity, at least, it might have been well if Christians could have been content to the end of time, to consider the name of Jesus, as a name at which every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and this, without dragging each other to the torture of a verbal exposition, relative to the precise nature of the relation between the Father and the Son. But alas! all Ecclesiastical History seems to be one continual and portentous commentary on the words of the Apostle—*there must be heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest*. And this controversy having once arisen, it should never be forgotten that it related to a matter, in itself of most stupendous solemnity. It may be true that there is something almost ludicrous, *when considered by itself*, in the artifice of the Semi-Arians, when they thought to gain their point merely by the sly introduction of a single *iôta*, thus converting *ὁμοούσιος* into *ὁμοιούσιος*. But when we recollect that the question which then agitated the world concerned no less a matter than the dignity and essence of Him, who is *the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever*, and that the very vitals of the controversy were, in truth, involved in this single *iôta*, when we recollect this, the spirit of levity and derision is instantly rebuked

to silence. Again, the personal quarrels and mutual recriminations of the Nicene Bishops, at the opening of the synod—the microscopic subtlety of the various disputants—the revelry of evil passions which the conflict let loose upon the empire,—all these become fit subjects for melancholy contemplation, rather than for scornful and sarcastic exposure, when once we call to mind the topic which men at that time were bandying from mouth to mouth, even the mysterious and tremendous majesty of the only begotten Son of God. With these impressions on our mind, we could have been well content with the absence of a quotation from Jortin, at present in the pages of Mr. Waddington; a quotation which exhibits the prelates of the Nicene Council as influenced by almost every imaginable variety of contemptible motive. And, further, in a future edition of this work, we would gladly see expunged a note in p. 97, in which, after speaking of Homousians, and Homoi-ousians, and Anomoians, and Eunomians, the author adds, “*the unimportance of the verbal difference might provoke our ridicule*, did we not reflect how much the angry application of those terms tended to prolong and embitter the controversy.” Of course the protraction, and the exasperation of the dispute, are, of themselves, abundantly sufficient to repress any feeling of *ridicule*. But, independently of this consideration, *ridicule*, as we contend, is an emotion *altogether* out of place, when the nature and attributes of the Redeemer of the World are under consideration, whatever may have been the folly or the intemperance of the combatants. With regard to the passage from Jortin, indeed, justice requires us to observe that Mr. Waddington has very properly qualified the words of that caustic and flippant, we had almost said heartless, writer, by adding, that,—

“Among so many assembled there, many there must have been of sincere intention and earnest piety; and, certainly, several well instructed in the learning of that age; and the excellence of these persons doubtless so influenced the general character of the Council, that, though unable to repress the intemperate violence of some of its members, they were sufficient to conduct it to that decision, which has now been followed by the great majority of Christians for fifteen centuries.”

One disastrous effect of this controversy was, that it made the Christian world familiar with the most sanguinary principles of intolerance. And, in the application of these principles, the heretics, in the day of their predominance, were, to say the least, quite as active as their Catholic antagonists. “The

path of intolerance," says Mr. Waddington, "which had been pointed out, and abandoned, by Constantine, was steadily followed by his heretical successor, Constantius, and trodden, with equal diligence, in the Eastern Empire, by Valens." And deplorable was the alacrity with which the people seconded the persecuting energies of their Imperial patrons. It is, indeed, generally allowed, that the Arians were throughout remarkable for their disingenuousness, their untractableness, their turbulence, and their readiness to launch the spiritual thunders at the head of their adversaries. There is one circumstance, more especially, in their history, which it is impossible to contemplate without the deepest indignation. We allude to the elevation of George of Cappadocia to the Patriarchate of Alexandria. The man, who was thus chosen by the Arian faction to fill the throne of Athanasius, was among the most worthless and profligate of mankind. This appears, not *only* from "the invectives of two Saints," (Gregory Nazianzen and Epiphanius,) "which," we are told,\* "might not of themselves deserve much credit:" but it so happens, that their testimony is "confirmed by the cool and impartial infidel," Ammianus Marcellinus. And a more revolting spectacle can scarcely be imagined than that of a fraudulent contractor for the supply of bacon to the army,—a monster of sensuality and avarice,—one who was resolved to be rich, and was contented to be infamous,—advanced, at last, by the basest arts to the Archiepiscopal chair of Egypt.\* And this, for no intelligible reason, save that the heretics beheld, in his former life, the promise that he would become an unsparing and remorseless persecutor. This promise was indeed fulfilled to an extent that was little thought of by the Arian party. "The Catholics of Alexandria," says Gibbon, "were abandoned to a tyrant, qualified by nature and education for the office of persecution." But his oppressions and atrocities were, at least, impartial. They were practised alike throughout his vast diocese, with little regard to the distinctions of faith and doctrine: till, at last, the justice of heaven was vindicated by the impatience of the multitude, and St. George of Cappadocia was massacred as an enemy to God and man.

It must be confessed that one of "*the two Saints*," who have described George of Cappadocia as a monster, has been scarcely more complimentary to the great heresiarch himself. By Gregory Nazianzen, Arius is represented as one whose very name

\* Gibbon, c. xxiii. note 118.

† See Gregor. Naz. Orat. xxi. where "*the Saint*" describes George as a monster and a pest, who came down upon the land, like an Egyptian plague, to the general calamity of the Church.



indicated the destructive violence and fury of his nature,—as a tornado of iniquity,—as a consummation of all impiety,—as a tongue at perpetual enmity with Christ,—as a mind which hurled its unrighteousness towards heaven,—as the persecutor of the Divinity,—and, to crown all, as resembling Judas in his character and his fate.\* A much more favourable representation of him is given by the other of these *Saints*,† and has been transcribed by Mr. Waddington into his pages. With this we have no fault whatever to find. But it does strike us, that, if we are to be told of the stately figure of Arius, of his grave but yet engaging deportment, his winning eloquence, his consummate address, and his masterly insight into human character,—space might also have easily been found for some adequate description of the genius, the virtues, the labours, and the constancy, of the mighty champion of the Catholic cause. Gibbon himself is compelled to do ample, and even splendid, justice to the merits of Athanasius; and to Gibbon, accordingly, our historian has referred his readers in a note. But still we cannot but think that a writer, who felt himself called upon to exhibit an advantageous portraiture of the heresiarch, might likewise have assigned a somewhat more spacious niche to the renowned and inflexible champion of orthodoxy. Our readers, therefore, will perhaps forgive us, if we presume to supply the deficiency, by exhibiting a representation of this illustrious man, as executed by Gregory Nazianzen.

“Athanasius,” says that eloquent father, “was exalted in his life, but lowly in his temper. His virtue was so sublime that none could aspire to rival it; while, at the same time, such was his courtesy and mildness, such his freedom from anger, such his propensity towards compassion, that he was at all times accessible to those who sought his intercourse. His conversation was pleasing; his manners still more engaging. His aspect was angelic; and still more angelic was his disposition. His rebuke was gentle: his praises carried with them all the power and weight of instruction. Each was so tempered, that neither of them was weakened by excess. His reproof conveyed the impression of paternal tenderness; his commendation had all the gravity which becomes imperial command. His demeanor had nothing in it of unmanly softness, or of rigorous and forbidding sternness. His gentleness won for him the reputation of benignity; his severity that of prudence and of judgment; and each of them were honoured with the praise of wisdom. So awful was the sanctity of his life, that it might well dispense with all the aids of eloquence. So commanding was his power of utterance, that the rod of authority was quiescent in his hand; or if, at any time, it became needful, it effected the work of correction, not with fierce laceration, but with a gentle touch . . . . . When he perceived that the whole world was in danger of being torn to pieces by a conflict about syllables, he mildly and benignantly brought both parties

\* Greg. Naz. Orat. xxi. xxiii.

† Epiphan. Heres. 69.

before him ; and, making all practicable concession, relative to the use of words, he bound down the disputants to the matter and substance of the controversy. The glory of his patience, in the work of reconciliation, far excelled the renown of his sufferings, and his preachings,—of his vigils and austerities,—and even of his exile and his wanderings. He was, to the last, unwearied in his application to men of every temper. Some he animated with his praises ; others he repressed with light and gentle correction. The sluggish he excited, and kept down the impetuous. He was incessantly careful that the feeble might not slip, and that the fallen might be raised up. In his personal manners, he was simple ; in the arts of government, inexhaustibly various. His words were wise, his soul was still more rich in wisdom. When engaged with men of humble endowments, he condescended to the level of their capacities. When he had to deal with loftier intellects, he rose, at once, to their elevation. He was the patron of strangers—the protector of suppliants—a guardian power against evil. In short, he substantially combined in his own person many of those attributes, which the heathen fabulously ascribe unto their deities. . . . . He closed his days in a mature and good old age ; and is now joined to the Fathers, and the Patriarchs, and the Prophets, and the Apostles, and the Martyrs, who have done valiantly for the truth of God.\*

The tenth chapter of this history carries on the annals of the Church from the days of Justinian to those of Charlemagne. We can do no more than transcribe the concluding paragraph of it :—

“ When we behold the limits of Christendom extended by the writings of its ministers, or the eloquence of its missionaries, we record such conquests with pure and grateful satisfaction. When we observe a mass of Pagans, or other unbelievers, suddenly, but peacefully, melting into the bosom of the Church, we question their motives, we lament the stain which they bring with them, and we censure any unworthy compromise which has been made to conciliate them ; yet we are consoled to reflect that no immediate misery has been occasioned by a change which, at least, is pregnant with future improvements. But when we see the sword employed to propagate a religion of which the very essence is peace, we are at once disgusted and revolted by the cruel and impious mockery.”

It is impossible for any humane or enlightened Christian of the present day to offer a single syllable in dissent from the sentiments here expressed. But it *may* be very possible to discover certain topics of consolation, and of thankfulness, even in the sanguinary annals of the early triumphs of the Cross. Most assuredly all the triumphs of Christianity *should* be pure and peaceable. If the best Christians of the present day could have their wish, purity and peace would be, if we may so express it, the Missionary Angels of the Gospel throughout the globe ; and none would ever dream of enlisting fraud or violence under the

\* Greg. Naz. Orat. xxi.



banners of their Redeemer. But then, on the other hand, it must be kept in mind, that the religion of Jesus had frequently to make its way in times of barbarism and of darkness. Nothing short of a perpetual course of miracles could have prevented the intrusion of human passions in that holy work. And if once the admixture of human passions be admitted, who shall presume to say to what extent that admixture might be endured by Him who can make all things work together for good. It is, in truth, mysterious enough, that "unworthy compromise," or sanguinary violence, should ever be allowed to lay their hand upon the ark of a cause so sacred. But we see that it has been so. We see the religion of Christ now flourishing in nations which, but for "unworthy compromise," or barbarian force, might for ages have been left in ignorance of their Redeemer. And what is the lesson which such spectacles administer to us? They teach us *not* to imitate the ferocity, or the deception, by which the knowledge of the truth was brought into the dark and cruel places of the earth. But they *do* teach us to adore the wisdom and the power of Him who directed the passions of barbarians to a merciful and beneficial end, and constrained the wrath and the iniquity of men to praise Him. If we are to think of the campaigns of Charlemagne merely as the enterprises of a human conqueror, whose lust of dominion was animated by superstitious zeal, we shall, of course, feel little else than disgust and indignation at the "cruel and impious mockery" of the conversions which he effected. But if we regard his warlike propensities as instruments in the hand of an inscrutable Providence, we shall see good reason to rejoice that such a man was "raised up," in those savage days, to lay the yoke of Christ upon the necks of ignorant and bloody tribes.

Among many other remarkable instances of the manner by which great national blessings are often developed out of the ordinary working and combination of sublunary elements, the following is afterwards noticed in the course of Mr. Waddington's narrative, c. xix. He there tells us that—

"Prussia and the contiguous Pomerania, had hitherto resisted the peaceful exertions of successive missionaries; and continued to worship the rude deities, and follow the barbarous manners, of antiquity. *But where the language of persuasion had been employed in vain, the disciplined valour of the Teutonic knights prevailed.* It was recompensed by the conquest of two rich provinces; and the faith which was inflicted upon the vanquished, in the rage of massacre, was perpetuated by the *deliberate oppression* of military government. This event took place about the year 1230. *But, in another generation, when the memory of its introduction was effaced, the religion really took root and flourished by the legitimate authority of its excellence and its truth.*"

And this, (whatever dismay or perplexity the spectacle may inflict upon us,) is the process by which *a highway for our God* is frequently prepared over the morass and the wilderness of this present world. The blessings of civilization and religion are often found to march in the train of bloodthirsty and ruthless ambition. These considerations, it is true, are absolutely good for nothing, if produced as motives for unsheathing the carnal blade, and for presenting to barbarous tribes, at the sword's point, the blessings of pure faith and social refinement. But these considerations *are* doubtless of most legitimate force and weight, when we *look back* upon the progress of Christ's kingdom through the earth. That kingdom is not of this world; and if any have sought to advance it by the use of worldly weapons, the guilt be on their own head. But if the spiritual influences of his kingdom are found to have emerged, at last, out of the "toil and trouble" of sanguinary enterprise, what remains for us, but thankfully to welcome so merciful a result, even while we sigh over the ruin and the havoc by which it was originally ushered in?

In his thirteenth chapter Mr. Waddington presents us with a view of the Ante-Nicene church; and, among other things, bestows a cursory notice on a subject of no inconsiderable difficulty, — the devotional forms and services then in use throughout the Christian world. It must, here, in all justice, be recollected, that Mr. Waddington, at the commencement of his labours, did not enjoy the advantage,—now possessed by us,—of consulting the invaluable work of Mr. Palmer, which was published in the course of last year;—we mean, the "*Origines Liturgicæ, or, Antiquities of the English Ritual; and a Dissertation on Primitive Liturgies.*" Of this performance it is scarcely possible to speak in terms of adequate commendation. It condenses, within the compass of two very moderate volumes, the result of much various and patient research; and furnishes the reader with a vast mass of information, which he would have otherwise been under the necessity of collecting from a formidable multitude of books. Had this disquisition fallen in the way of Mr. Waddington early enough in the course of his sore task, we apprehend that it would have induced him considerably to modify his judgment, on the subject of the ancient liturgies. His conjecture is, that—

"The earliest forms of services were extremely short and variable—otherwise more ample specimens of them would have reached posterity. On the other hand, the scanty passages which are adduced from Ignatius, Justin, Irenæus, and Tertullian, certainly prove that there were *some* fixed prayers in use in some of the ancient churches, which may or may not, have been common to them all."

That such should be his view of the matter will not, probably

appear very surprising to any one who will take the trouble to consult Mr. Palmer's Introduction. From this it appears, that the study of liturgies is one which, from various circumstances, has made but slow progress; that it was not till the eighteenth century that the *materials* of knowledge were supplied in sufficient abundance to enable the student of liturgies to take an extended and unprejudiced view of the subject; that the most learned men were long divided, as to the merits of the liturgical remains; that the subject was further involved in obscurity by the controversies of the times; and, lastly, that an erroneous notion was long and generally prevalent, that there was, originally, some *one* form of liturgy in the Christian church, to which all the monuments of ancient liturgies, and the notices which the Fathers supply, might be reduced. The laborious researches of Mr. Palmer have conducted him to the conclusion that all the primitive liturgies may be reduced to four; namely, the great Oriental liturgy—the Alexandrian—the Roman—and the Gallican. These he considers as the parents of all the forms now extant: and he, further, regards their antiquity as so very remote, and their use so extensive, in those ages when bishops were independent, that, in his judgment, it is difficult to place their origin at a lower period than the apostolic age. It is, indeed, well known that every Christian church possessed, and exercised, the liberty of varying and improving its own formularies. And this practice, upon a superficial view of the matter, might seem to involve the claim of these four liturgies to apostolic antiquity in hopeless doubt and confusion. On a more accurate examination, however, it will appear that this very circumstance adds powerful confirmation to the claim. For, where a discretionary power was generally exercised, what but a reverence for the apostolic source of these formularies, could have preserved them from indefinite mutilation and change? What but this could have maintained the *essential* uniformity, which is actually found to have prevailed throughout vast districts of the primitive church?

It is not, however, to be imagined that these, or any other liturgies, were, from the first, committed to writing. For a very considerable period, they were preserved entirely by memory and practice. That this was so, is collected by Mr. Palmer from a diligent attention to the notices supplied by the Fathers. It is impossible, he says, to consult these notices, without perceiving, that the baptized Christians were supposed to be familiar with every part of the service. Continual allusions are made to various particulars, which are wholly incapable of explanation, otherwise than by reference to the liturgies still extant. The order of the

parts is always found to be preserved. The same rites and ceremonies are continually repeated. The same sentiments and language, without material variation, are transmitted from generation to generation. The people were perfectly familiar with the precise points at which their responses were to be made, their hymn to be chanted, or their well-known prayer to be recited. And if each church thus preserved the substantial uniformity of its own liturgy,—a general and substantial uniformity would, likewise, be found, even after the lapse of centuries, in the liturgies of those churches, which had originally received the same order. The period at which liturgies were first committed to writing is altogether uncertain; but there is reason to believe that it was not *later* than the end of the third century, or the beginning of the fourth.

We have thought it advisable to notice the above particulars, partly with the view of encouraging our readers to resort to Mr. Palmer's work, in which these particulars are illustrated with admirable judgment and erudition; and partly with a view to supply the needful correction to the statement of Mr. Waddington, which, in its present shape, scarcely does justice to the antiquity or importance of liturgical and ritual formularies. The subject is one of profound and solemn interest to the church of England. How animating and delightful is it, for instance, to know that our prayers and services are, in form and substance, nearly the same with those, in which the spirits of the primitive worthies magnified their God and their Redeemer. To advert, for the present, to our *collects* only.

"They have been read," says Mr. Palmer, "in the liturgies of the church of England from the most remote period. Not only do we find them in the liturgies of the English church before the reformation, but in those of the Anglo-Saxon church long before the conquest. Most of these collects can, in fact, be traced back to the very beginning of the Anglo-Saxon church; and by that church they were originally derived from the liturgy of the Roman patriarchate in primitive times. We are thus enabled to trace them back, in many instances, to the fifth century. So that our collects, with some exceptions, have been used for 1400 years in the church of God; and their origin lies in the distant glory of primitive Christianity."—*Palm. Orig. Liturg.* vol. ii. pp. 39, 40.

Being now fairly launched into the boundless expanse of ecclesiastical story, one object which most forcibly arrests our attention, is the colossal form of Hildebrand—the Napoleon of the church! The portraiture of this astonishing specimen of the human race affords Mr. Waddington a noble opportunity for the exercise of his powers. Nothing can well be more masterly than his condensation of the history of this mighty architect of the papal

fabric. It appears that a portion of the early life of Hildebrand was passed in the celebrated monastery of Cluni. And here it probably was, that his fancy expatiated amid the visions of ecclesiastical grandeur, which his own towering genius subsequently realized. It was in the year 1049 that he first emerged into public notice. We are told that when Leo IX. was on his way through France to Rome, he became acquainted with the monk of Cluni. This pontiff was indebted for his elevation to the appointment of the emperor, Henry III.; and he was, accordingly, travelling to take possession of the apostolic see, in his pontifical attire, as if he were already pope. Hildebrand remonstrated vigorously against this premature assumption of dignity; and actually prevailed on Leo to lay aside these outward symbols of the pontificate, to enter Rome in the habit of a pilgrim, and there to receive from the clergy and the people that apostolical office which no layman on earth could have the right to confer. The pope was so deeply struck with the ability and strength of character exhibited by the recluse, that he withdrew him from his retirement, and carried him to Rome. From that moment we may fairly date the commencement of his greatness. His influence soon became almost omnipotent at the Vatican: and, for four and twenty years, he may be said to have exercised the pontifical power, although he was not invested with the apostolic office. It was not till 1073 that he ascended the chair of St. Peter; and then it was that his gigantic purposes broadly unfolded themselves to the gaze of an astonished world.

“The spiritual despotism of the pope,” says Mr. Waddington in his retrospect of the papal history, “transcends any exhibition of human power, described in any history, until we approach the surpassing magnitude of his temporal pretensions. The design of Gregory VII. was the most daring imagination of human ambition. To establish the chair of St. Peter, as the source of *all* power, secular as well as pastoral, civil as well as ecclesiastical—to subject all kings and all governments to the crozier of an unarmed aged priest—to regulate the politics of the world by the annual meeting of a Senate of Ecclesiastics, under the eye of that autocrat—to dispose of all countries and of all thrones—to create monarchs, and then to suspend or to depose them—to sport, as it were, with all that is sublime and mighty in earthly things—such was a scheme beyond the boldest conception of secular pride;—and it was engendered, where alone it could have found any nourishment, in the breast of a monk.”

A modern reader, indeed, as yet unacquainted with the prodigies of the papal history, might, perhaps, be tempted to add, that projects like these could find no entertainment but “in the breast” of a maniac. To such a person, the edicts of a straw-crowned monarch in a cell of Bedlam would scarcely appear

more extravagant and insane than the pretensions of Hildebrand. And yet, Hildebrand was no maniac : or, at least, his insanity was no other than that which has invaded other minds of prodigious capacity and ungovernable ardour. It was no other than that which has often, before and since, directed the destinies of the world, and left its burning impress upon the face of human society. And then, too, we should ever bear in mind the peculiar condition of Christendom, when this Olympian potentate began to thunder from the Vatican. Europe was, at that period, in a state of anarchy and degradation. The Ecclesiastical Supremacy had already been expanding itself, by degrees, to almost superhuman dimensions. The confusion of temporal with ecclesiastical authority had been worse confounded by the introduction of the feudal system. And, further, the aggressions and usurpations of the secular power had frequently been such as might well arouse the energies of a daring spirit, which had long been meditating, even to madness, on the transcendent privilege of binding and loosing both in heaven and on earth. These circumstances, as Mr. Waddington remarks, may somewhat mitigate the astonishment awakened by the bare recital of such stupendous audacity, and moderate the execrations with which the name of Gregory VII. has often been assailed by the indignant voice of History.

Few things are more surprising than the *deliberate* enthusiasm with which this extraordinary man carried his designs into execution. His energy did not confine themselves to a conflict with his imperial adversary. The kingdom of France was declared to be tributary to Rome. Spain was pronounced to have been among the possessions of the apostolic see, from the earliest ages of Christianity, although the grant by which it had been conveyed had, unhappily, perished among other ancient monuments. Saxony was an undoubted feudal dependence, held in subjection to the pontifical chair. William the Norman was astonished to find that he held the conquered realm of England as a fief of Rome. The kingdom of Naples was in the same condition of tributary subjection. The innumerable dukes and princes of Germany, of Hungary, of Russia, of Poland, of Croatia and Dalmatia,—all were reminded of their subjection to the viceroy of heaven, and urged to acknowledge their unquestionable vassalage. All the kingdoms of the world were bound in chains to the throne of St. Peter, on pain of being stamped as traitors to the universal majesty of Christ. And these voracious claims were advanced with the intrepid confidence of one who seems to have no more suspected any flaw in his title, than the heir of any peaceful and settled monarchy on earth suspects the legitimacy of his own succession !



In Hildebrand, in short, all the elements of ecclesiastical despotism and ambition, which had been floating abroad for some centuries, were concentrated, and visibly embodied, and brought into intense and violent action. And their operation, in his person, is admirably traced and exhibited by Mr. Waddington. Among those by whom the work of flagitious denomination was carried on, in the course of the next two centuries, the most distinguished names are Innocent III. and IV., and Boniface VIII. But these, after all, were but inferior spirits compared with the magnificent genius of Gregory VII. Their character and history are given with great power by Mr. Waddington. The last of them, Boniface VIII., was, in many respects, little better than a ferocious ruffian. We can imagine nothing much more horrible than the account of his last moments. After he had suffered the outrageous insult and temporary confinement, inflicted by Nogaret,—

“ Infuriated by the disgrace of his captivity, he hurried from Anagni to Rome, burning for revenge. But the violence of his passion presently overpowered his reason, and his death immediately followed. He was attended by an ancient servant, who exhorted him to confide himself in his calamity to the consoler of the afflicted. But Boniface made no reply. His eyes were haggard, his mouth white with foam, and he gnashed his teeth in silence. He passed the day without nourishment, the night without repose. And when he found that his strength began to fail, and that his end was not far distant, he removed all his attendants, that there might be no witness to his final feebleness and his parting struggle. After some interval, his attendants burst into the room, and beheld his body stretched on the bed, stiff and cold. The staff which he carried bore the marks of his teeth, and was covered with foam. His white locks were stained with blood; and his head was so closely wrapt in the counterpane, that he was believed to have anticipated his impending death by violence and suffocation.”

Such was the dreadful end of the earthly *representative* of Him, who, in the anguish of the Cross, prayed that his enemies might be forgiven. Such was the death-bed of the man of whom it was said, that he entered the Pontificate like a fox, that he reigned like a lion, and perished like a dog! The horrors of the picture are scarcely transcended by those ascribed by Shakespeare to the parting agonies of Cardinal Beaufort.

From the death of Boniface, with greater precision than from any other period, may be reckoned the downward course of the Papacy. At the very time when he received the insult which exasperated him to fury, he was preparing to launch a Bull, declaring that, “as Vicar of Jesus Christ, he had power to govern kings with a rod of iron, and to break them in pieces like a potter’s vessel.” But, from the moment of his decease, this power

began gradually to pass away from the throne of St. Peter. The transfer of the Apostolic seat to Avignon immediately followed: and during this "Babylonish captivity," the papal ascendancy melted imperceptibly away. Then came the grand and fatal Schism, which, more than any event which had yet occurred, enervated and paralyzed the Pontifical Supremacy. Lastly ensued the Councils of Pisa, of Constance, and of Basle, which still more fearfully impaired the Pontifical Omnipotence, and rendered the very name of a General Council a sound of terror and aversion in the ear of all succeeding popes. By this time, the lineaments of high and superhuman daring were well nigh obliterated from the aspect of the papacy. They were succeeded by the features of an abject and vile degeneracy. From henceforth the attributes of the Pontiffs, for the most part, were fraud, and perjury, and avarice, and nepotism, and every imaginable form of contemptible turpitude. The scene closes with the fifth Lateran Council, which abolished the Pragmatic Sanction; renewed the celebrated constitution *Unam Sanctam* of Boniface VIII.; and then separated with entire self-confidence and complacency, as if they had settled all the affairs of the church on an immovable foundation! They finished their labours in March 1517, in the midst of mutual congratulations. In the course of that very year, Luther commenced, in the schools of Wittenburgh, the fulminations which shook one half of this *imperishable* fabric to ruins.

All these occurrences and vicissitudes are described by Mr. Waddington with most conspicuous ability. Familiar as they must be to every reader of Ecclesiastical history, it is impossible to peruse them in his pages without a vivid and perpetually renovated interest. We are unable worthily to illustrate by extracts our opinion of the merits of his narrative. But we cannot forbear to insert his splendid comparison of the characters of Gregory VII. and Innocent III.

"In the comparison which we might here be tempted to draw between Innocent III. and the greatest among his predecessors, there is perhaps no point on which the preference could be refused to Gregory. Both availed themselves of the divisions of the empire; but the favourable circumstances which Innocent found, Gregory in a great measure created. The design of universal monarchy, which was carried so far into execution by the one, was conceived and transmitted to him by the other. With Innocent the liberation of the Holy Sepulchre was made the excuse for pecuniary exactions; with Gregory it was the lofty aspiration of erring magnanimity, earnest, and attended by a determination to devote his repose and person to the cause which he deemed holy. In the treatment of heretical delinquency, the one was moderate beyond the principles of his age and the passions of his



clergy ; the other urged the course and heated the rage of persecution, and by his perversion of the crusading frenzy into that channel, identified in the popular hatred dissent with infidelity, and established the law of vengeance, and multiplied the crimes of his posterity. And after all, how severely soever we may condemn the means which have created it, there is something of majesty and magnificence in the character of a spiritual despotism—an invisible power which enthrals mankind without the aid of physical force, and even in defiance of it ; which humbles the mightiest sceptre, and blunts the sharpest sword by a menace or a censure ; a power mysterious and undefinable, swaying the human race by the name—the much-abused name—of religion. If we look, indeed, to its origin, it is only an empire over man's ignorance and credulity. Still it is the empire of intellect ; and as such it stands on loftier ground than that worldly fabric which employed the ambition of Innocent ; the mere temporal sovereignty of arms and opulence, supported by corruption and massacre.”—p. 361.

There is something so hideously revolting in the annals of the papal superstition, during its worst ages of corruption, that the soul sickens at the recital, and is apt to be invaded, at times, by a feeling of despair. It seems, almost, as if Almighty God had given up the children of men to their “ hearts' lusts,” and had utterly withdrawn Himself from all concern in their affairs : or, rather, it seems as if the helpless and ignorant millions of mankind had been created for no other purpose, but to be enslaved, and trampled upon, and eaten up like bread, by the most odious and worthless of the human race. This sort of perilous misgiving, indeed, is perpetually haunting the student of history, in all its various departments. But its persecution is peculiarly intolerable throughout the darkest periods of the annals of the Church. Almost every edict which, century after century, issued from the Vatican, in those dreadful days, sounds in our ears like a blasphemous abuse and prostitution of the holy name of Christ. It causes our blood to curdle, and our very flesh to creep upon our bones : so that one is tempted frequently to wonder that fire did not descend from heaven to consume the monster of the Seven Hills, or that the earth did not yawn beneath its feet and swallow it up. One duty, therefore, of the enlightened historian undoubtedly is, to guard his readers against the predominance of these despondent emotions ; to lift up the hearts of the pious and faithful ; to remind them, that crime and villainy are the phenomena which always must rush upward to the surface of human affairs, and impart a fearful and calamitous interest to the story of our species ; while the workings of good are silent and unseen, and therefore often unsuspected. And we are happy to find that Mr. Waddington has not been unmindful of this duty. He seems, throughout, unwilling to appear as the accuser or the slanderer of

human nature: and, though it is his painful task to speak of the abominable phrenzy of the Vatican, and the heaven-defying iniquities of the Romish hierarchy, he is likewise careful to admonish us, that, in meditating on the ways of Providence, we are not to confine our regards to principalities, and powers, and spiritual wickedness in high places. We are to remember that, while the great ones of the earth were revelling in their earthly, sensual, and devilish wisdom, there probably was many a lowly and quiet region, where the gracious influences of heaven were dispensing their sunshine, and were ripening the fruits of that wisdom which is pure, and peaceable, and holy. The piety which was nourished in those retreats might, indeed, be misdirected, and erroneous, and far beneath the standard of Evangelic sanctity. But still the spirit of faith and self denial might have been there; and who can tell whether its offerings might not be accepted by the Father of Mercies? Who can pronounce that the savour of ignorant superstition which adhered to them, might not be cleansed away by the blood of Him who ever liveth to intercede for us? The generous and *truly* Catholic spirit will always be inclined to seek repose and consolation in the cautious and reverent indulgence of this benevolent optimism. And, doubtless, this sort of optimism it is, which has dictated the following and other similar passages, which occur in the pages of Mr. Waddington.

“The real heroes of Ecclesiastical history are those, whose belief and life are regulated by the laws of Christ; and the very circumstance, which constitutes their excellence, ensures their obscurity. They are not without their reward even in this world—but it is not in the enjoyment of renown, or in the hope of wordly immortality. It is in silence, that they perform their offices of charity; it is in secrecy, that they fulfil the commands of their Master; it is in humility, that they exalt their fellow-creatures: and as soon as their peaceful course of usefulness is over, they disappear, and leave no sort of trace or record of their virtues. It is to the proud, the turbulent, the ambitious, to the fanatic or the hypocrite, that the pages of the annalist are principally consecrated; and those whose life has been an insult to their religion, stand far more prominent in the Ecclesiastical picture, than those who have loved and obeyed it. It is not, that many have not existed, even in the worst ages of the Church, whose almost spontaneous piety has supplied its laws and corrected its abuses, and repaired, as far as their private influence extended, the ruins of its discipline—under whose sacred guardianship the treasures of life have been faithfully dispensed, and whose example has given sanction to their instructions. It is not, that even monastic depravity has not been redeemed by thousands of instances of monastic excellence. But it is, that the vices have been registered and blazoned, while the opposite qualities have either attracted no notice, or have generally been so exaggerated, as to revolt our reason and belief. Among the numerous progeny of

saints, so venerated by Catholics, so proscribed by Protestants, there have been some examples of pure Evangelical holiness; there have been some cardinals who have dared to deviate from the rule of profligacy; there have been many prelates, eminent for learning and integrity, as the History of National Churches and General Councils sufficiently demonstrates. But such characters were far more common among the humble and undistinguished pastors, who were free from the vanity, the enthusiasm, or the ambition, which so often lurks beneath the garb of *celebrated* sanctity. Yet the eye of the historian is fixed by the austere and wonder-working Saint, by the pompous Prelate, and the intriguing and rapacious Cardinal, while it overlooks the plants which flourish in the lower regions of serenity and fruitfulness. Notwithstanding, it is scarcely too much to affirm, that it was the zeal and piety of the inferior clergy, which so long supported the cumbrous machinery of the Court and Prelacy of Rome. It was their virtues, which sustained the vices of their superiors; it was their humble piety which enabled mitred apostates so long to outrage the name of Christ. And it was not till the poison had descended to the extremities of the system, and communicated even to the village pastor some portion of its hierarchical malignity, that the Church of Rome reeled to its foundation, and by its weakness and depravity invited and justified the rebellion of its children."—pp. 701, 702.

It is well known that there are some writers and students of Ecclesiastical History, who take a different view of this matter. Being deeply and conscientiously persuaded that the only *design* of the Gospel was to deliver a certain fixed portion of the human race, from the forfeiture incurred by the disobedience of the first man, they are keenly on the watch, throughout their historical researches, to discover this peculiar people, this elect and precious remnant. And having, as they honestly persuade themselves, traced the continued existence of the *little flock*, from age to age, they, comparatively, possess their souls in peace. The purposes of God towards those whom he foreknew, and pre-ordained to life, are thus manifestly fulfilled: and, this being so, the fate of all the remaining sons of Adam is a matter, if not wholly beyond human sympathy, at least very far beyond human curiosity or solicitude. They who are preserved, in the midst of idolatrous and corrupt generations, are monuments of redeeming mercy. They who are lost are but vessels reserved for that dishonour, which is no more than the righteous doom of a depraved and apostate world. To examine the justness of these notions, would evidently be to plunge into a pathless wilderness of controversy. Thus much, however, may surely be said without the slightest breach of charity,—that there are many sincere and humble Christians who can derive but little peace or comfort from this view of the Divine counsels; many, who can find rest unto their souls in nothing but a chastised and reverential hope, that the Lord

may have a treasury of secret mercies in store even for them who have been wandering, to all appearance, in the deadliest shadows of superstitious ignorance; especially if they have welcomed the faintest gleams of light which may have reached them through that thick and palpable darkness. These, indeed, are meditations, to which, in all their extent, humanity is unequal. But still, we cannot but think it more in harmony with the whole spirit of revelation to cultivate a hopeful temper, when we are attempting to scan the dealings of Omnipotence, than to be dwelling perpetually on, here and there, a little Goshen, visited exclusively with the blessed light of heaven.

Others, again, there are, who seem to imagine that the cause of the Reformation is well nigh hopeless, unless it can be clearly made out that, from the days of the Ante-Nicene Church to those of Luther, a continuous and audible testimony or protestation was lifted up against the corruptions and the usurpations of the see of Rome. For our parts, we confess that we should be in "huge dismay," if we believed that this was the only ground, on which the question between us and the Romanists could be brought to its arbitrement. "Much," says Mr. Waddington, "has been written about the *Lutheranism* that was prevalent before *Luther*; the unbroken series of *witnesses to the truth*; the unceasing protestations which have been silently breathed, in all ages, against the abuses of Rome." What protestations may have been breathed *in silence*, it would, of course, be difficult for mortal sagacity to pronounce; however *probable* it may be, that the hearts of many may, at all times, have secretly revolted against the perpetual violations inflicted by the hierarchy of Rome on the *simplicity which is in Christ*. As to any other protestations, we are much of Mr. Waddington's mind—namely, that it would be a very formidable task indeed to show, historically, that there exists a continued chain of testimony, with every link visible, between the primitive verity, *as clear of all corruptions*, and the whole system of our reformed doctrine. Thus much, however, we do believe,—that the essential principles of the Christian faith have been taught *in the Catholic Church*, throughout all ages, from the beginning. It is true that fraud, and violence, and remorseless persecution, may have compelled the Western World to swallow much impurity, together with the sincere milk of God's holy word. For although she, who calleth herself, exclusively, the Catholic Church, hath ever vaunted her *immutable* theology, the boast appears to have been verified only in one respect; namely, that her rulers have forcibly asserted their *immutable* right to make incessant change and innovation. It may be further true, that, to a fearful extent, the spurious ingredients may have prac-

tically neutralized the wholesome quality of the original element. But still, the original element was in the chalice; and, as for the impure ingredients, they can, with no justice, be regarded as preparations compounded by the Catholic Church. They were tossed in, successively, and most prodigally, by members of the Romish Communion. But when did the work of these mighty magicians receive even the semblance of complete synodical authority, till the meeting of the Council of Trent? And what better title does the Council of Trent deserve, than that which has sometimes been given it, of the *conspiracy* of Trent? At all events, the Council of Trent was no legitimate representative of the universal Church. It was not attended or recognized by the Eastern Patriarchs, nor by the Metropolitans or Bishops of the Church of England. And accordingly,—

“ All the great Eastern and Apostolical Churches of Constantinople, Antioch, Alexandria, Ephesus, Cæsarea, Russia, Georgia, as well as the ancient sects of Monophysites and Nestorians, in Egypt, Syria, Chaldea, Persia, Armenia, India, Tartary, and China, always rejected these doctrines (the doctrines peculiar to the Church of Rome), as they almost universally reject them at the present day.”\*

If, then, we were to be asked, where was *Lutheranism* before the days of *Luther*, we should by no means be careful to answer in this matter; or we should be content to say that, really, we do not very well know where it was. Luther was, undoubtedly, a mighty instrument in the hand of Providence for exposing the corruptions of the Church of Rome, and for denouncing the usurpations of the Bishop of Rome, and for girding up the Western Churches to the work of their own deliverance and purification. And, for these services, the name of Luther is, doubtless, worthy to be had in everlasting and honourable remembrance. But, as members of a reformed branch of the Catholic Church, we are no more bound to say where the whole Lutheran system of theology and discipline was lurking, before the appearance of Luther, than we are bound to give a similar account of the system of Calvin. And if, again, we were to be asked, where was the Church of England previously to the time of Henry VIII. or of Elizabeth, we should reply,—that it was just where it is now; only that it had then been, for some ages, in a state of defilement and of slavery. Its restoration we owe to the labours of our own Reformers, who seized the cup from the hand of the sorceress, and, by their powerful alchemy, precipitated to the bottom all the pernicious drugs; and then presented the waters of life, in their genuine purity, to a thirsty people. And this work of theirs

\* Palmer's Orig. Liturgy, vol. ii. p. 253, 254.

would have been equally lawful, and worthy of all acceptance, even if neither Vaudois, nor Albigenses, nor Paulicians, nor various other sects, who have been honoured with the title of the progenitors of Protestantism, had ever presumed to meddle with the mixture. If not a single public testimony had been uttered, by any one society or party, from the days of Constantine to the days of Henry, against the gradual encroachments of the Western Patriarch, or against the creeping corruptions of the Romish theology,—the Church of England would, most unquestionably, still have had the right to assert, at any time, her original independence, and to bring back her doctrines and her usages to the standard of primitive practice, and of scriptural truth.

With regard to the unbroken and visible continuity of sound opinion,—

“The question is”—(we are here using the words of Joseph Mede)—“whether the society of men of our Christian belief hath, in all ages, been, for the outside, a distinct corporation from all other societies, or states of men. My answer is—that for divers of the first ages it was in that manner visibly distinguished. But after an apostacy had overspread and deformed the beautiful spouse of Christ, then was the society, or the belief, as it were, covered and involved in the same external mantle with them, and, as it were, hidden in that dark cloud; and so, not a distinct society from the rest. But though, in the inward communion of the sincere faith, it was diverse and distinguished, yet it still, for the most part, continued a member of the same external body with them; being begotten of the same sacrament of baptism, taught, in some part, by the same word and pastors still continuing amongst them; and submitting to the same jurisdiction and regimen, so far forth as these had yet some soundness remaining in them. But for the rest, whether in doctrine or in practice, that was not compatible with their sincere faith, either wisely avoiding all communion with it; or, if they could not, then patiently suffering for their conscience sake, under the hands of tyrants, named Christians.”

On this passage we have only to remark, that, although it says the truth, it does not appear to us to say the whole truth. For we have little doubt that there were numbers, in every age, whose ill-informed conscience never prompted them to avoid communion with Rome, even in what we now know to be her corruptions; and whom yet we may surely venture to reckon among the faithful. And if it be asked, how this could be, we should reply, that, although the traditional and superstitious vanities of Rome may have entered into their scheme of religion, yet may their spiritual stamina (if we so may speak) have been strong enough to counteract the poisonous effect of the false doctrines, while it received the healing efficacy of the true; and so, may have preserved the vitals of their Christianity unimpaired. Such



men were Pascal and Fenelon, and many other worthies of the same stamp, who, doubtless, might be found, at all periods, in the bosom of the Romish Church: for if men like these were not Christians, where is Christianity to be found? But, to proceed with Joseph Mede:—

“ For understanding this, take this simile. When gold is mixed with a greater quantity of counterfeit metal, so that, of both, becomes one mass or lump; though each metal still retains and keeps his nature diverse from the other; yet can they not be outwardly discerned asunder by the eye. But, when the refiner comes and severs them, then will each metal appear in his own outside, and in his proper colours, whereby they are easily discerned asunder, one from the other. Such must the state of the Church needs be, when an apostacy shall rise out of the bowels thereof. And such do we affirm was the state of the Church of Christ, in that great prevailing apostacy, from which we are separated. The purer metal of the Christian body was not outwardly discernible from the base and counterfeit, while one outside covered them both. But when the time of refining came, then was our Church,—*not* first founded in the faith, (God forbid!); but a part of the Christian body, newly refined from such corruptions as time had gathered; as gold refined begins not then first to be gold, though it began first to be refined. So our Church began not, a hundred years ago, to be a Church; though then it first began to be a Reformed Church.”\*

So much for the question, whether an unbroken series of *Protestant* testimonies can be clearly and confidently traced upwards from the Reformation to the purest ages of the Church. And the above being our views of the matter, we confess that we regard the issue of that question with very little disturbance of our composure. We observe, however, that Mr. Waddington ascribes the labour bestowed upon this question by many learned and pious Protestants, in part, to their anxiety that the perpetual succession of the ministry might not seem wanting to the Reformed Communities. We know not how this point is viewed by Mr. Waddington himself. But, for ourselves, we can only say, that such anxiety appears to us exceedingly misplaced. Even if it were proved that there was a regular *doctrinal* succession among the Vaudois, and the men of Lyons, and other sects who *protested* against the tyranny and the perversions of Rome, this would not establish the fact that they had a legitimate *ministerial* succession. And, again, if their claim to a *ministerial* succession could be made good, what would it be to us? We derive not our ordinations through the Vaudois, or the men of Lyons, but through an unbroken series of bishops, the rightful successors of those who ruled our Church from the beginning. We are, therefore, quite unable to discern how the validity of the orders, or the mis-

\* Jos. Mede's Works, Disc. xxix.

sion of our Reformed Clergy can be affected, one way or the other, by the fate of this inquiry. In order to shake the claim of our own Church to a regular spiritual descent, one of two things must be shown; either that the Apostolic succession was fatally vitiated by erroneous opinions or practices, adopted by the ministers of our Church in the days of her impurity; or that, since the Reformation, our Orders have been uncanonical and schismatical. There are few intelligent and learned Protestants, we imagine, who will contend for either of these propositions; and as for the latter of them, it is not confidently or unanimously maintained even by the Roman Catholics themselves. Some Roman Catholic writers,—as Mr. Waddington is doubtless well aware,—have distinctly admitted the validity of our English Ordinations; and others have not only admitted it, but urgently *contended* for it. But this is a matter far too copious for discussion in these pages. They who desire to see it clearly and conclusively treated, have only to consult the work of Mr. Palmer, to which we have already adverted.\*

We had well nigh forgotten to state that, in p. 206, Mr. Waddington (having adverted to the abuse of deferring baptism until the hour of death, which prevailed in the early centuries,) observes, in a note, that Gibbon somewhere proposes a question which he (Mr. Waddington) professes his inability to resolve, namely, whether this pernicious practice was at any time condemned by any Council of the Church? An answer to this inquiry, we think, may be found in the 12th Canon of the Council of Neocæsarea; which seems to pronounce baptism unlawful and invalid, when administered to any sick person. An exception, however, is cautiously made in favour of cases, where the individual baptised might live to manifest the seriousness and the sincerity of his Christian profession; and also, (if we understand the words rightly,) where the population was very thin, and the administration of the sacraments consequently unfrequent and irregular. The words of the Canon are these:—'Εαν τις νοσῶν φανισθῇ, εἰς πρεσβύτερον ἀγεσθαι οὐ δύναται· οὐκ ἐκ προαιρέσεως, γὰρ, ἡ πίσις αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ' ἐξ ἀνάγκης· εἰ μὴ, ταχὰ, διὰ τὴν μετὰ ταυτὰ αὐτοῦ σπουδὴν καὶ πίσιν, καὶ διὰ σπάνιν ἀνθρώπων. The practice was, possibly, one with which the Church found it difficult to interfere very effectually. In our own times, it is to be feared, the spirit of the Church of England is too often violated by the administration of the Eucharist to persons on their death-bed; even though they may have notoriously and systematically refused it during the whole course of their lives, in spite of exhortations and entreaties to attend the

\* Orig. Liturgy, vol. ii. c. xii.



altar. This practice bears a considerable resemblance to the clinic baptism of ancient times; and yet it is a practice which we might find it no easy matter wholly to suppress.

---

ART. II.—*Christ Crucified; an Epic Poem, in Twelve Books.*

By William Ellis Wall, M.A., of Trinity College, Oxford.—Oxford, Parker, 1833. pp. 515.

TALK not unto us of the courage of the men who led the storming party at Badajoz; talk not unto us of him who first scaled the icy barriers of the Alps, or of him who first committed his frail bark to the savage ocean with the triple brass around his breast: talk not unto us of Decius, or Curtius, or Nelson, or Sir Sydney Smith, or Blucher, or Marshal Ney, or any other example, either ancient or modern, of valour and self-devotion. Here is a man who has published an epic poem in twelve books of blank verse, in the year 1833! Captain Ross is a craven to him. Mr. Wall deserves a niche in the Temple of Immortality, simply on the ground of his own adventurous daring,—to say nothing of the boldness of his bookseller.

Yet we hear of similar phenomena as having been lately visible. We hear something of a French-Italian epic,\* of which Napoleon is the hero; but we have not been able so far to screw up our own courage as to speak from personal knowledge; for we would almost rather have fought through the campaigns both of the Consulate and the Empire, than encounter them in French heroic verse. We hear again of an epic poem in Sanscrit by an English clergyman. For ourselves, at such an announcement as this, we can only lift up our hands and marvel. We think, however, that there is something still more sublimely magnanimous in the conduct of the man, who, in the present day, can make an offering of a sacred epic, containing, we believe, about sixteen thousand lines, to that most utilitarian, mechanical, and prosaic personage the British public.

In a word, “*Vixêre fortes ante Agamemnoua,*” brave men have lived before Mr. Ellis Wall; but none so brave as he. Yet the world is full of ingratitude. We almost fear, that, after having displayed so much of active resolution, Mr. Wall will be now called upon to exhibit, according to the words quoted by himself,

“The better fortitude  
Of patience, and heroic martyrdom.”

There is one circumstance, however, which produces some abatement of our admiration. We half suspect that Mr. Wall's valour has mainly consisted in an insensibility to his peril. He

\* *Napoléon, Poème, en dix chants, Français-Italien, prix, cartonné, 16s.*

has rushed upon his adventure without a full acquaintance with its manifold difficulty and its extreme danger. We do not merely mean, that he has not appreciated the popular distaste for long and elaborate and didactic poems, but that he has not sufficiently estimated the combination of natural and acquired endowments—the genius and the knowledge—the multifarious variety of qualifications and resources—the vast outlay of time and toil—indispensable for the composition of an epic poem. An epic poem! it is a work considerable enough to employ the whole span of a man's mortal existence. How many years has Mr. Wall devoted to “Christ Crucified?” Too many, we apprehend, for himself; but too few for the nature of his production.

Our author, nevertheless, has proceeded “*secundum artem*,” with the most approved rules before him. But, alas, for the manufacture neither of an epic poem nor a pudding, is a good receipt enough, unless good materials are also provided. In a preface, wherein Mr. Wall informs us,—unfortunately, without duly impressing the fact upon his own mind,—that “the severe code of Parnassus peremptorily denounces all poetic mediocrity,” he thus learnedly continues to dissert:—

“In the present brief outlines of the plan of this work, the more important points only of epic criticism will be noticed: 1. the materials of the poem; 2. the machinery; 3. the morals; 4. the characters; and 5. the versification.”—*Preface*, p. i.

These several points he discusses in their order, with that respectful quantity of reference to the treatises of Aristotle, which we naturally expect, and we must allow that we are seldom disappointed, from gentlemen who have graduated at Oxford. Unable, as we are, to follow him through his remarks, we must content ourselves with assuring our readers that they will not be offended by wild and innovating theories, as Mr. Wall implicitly obeys what “the father of criticism has decided.” The machinery is Miltonic, not, however, without some curious additions, as, for instance, an evil spirit, who assumes the form of King Solomon. We heartily trust, that no man will ever be profane enough to burlesque this poem, and introduce an evil spirit assuming the form of Mr. Wall. The conduct of the story is Homeric, or Virgilian; as, for example, to give a more dramatic form to the narrative, “the blessed Virgin, through the interest of Nicodemus, obtains an audience of the Procurator in the Prætorium,” and then and there relates some important circumstances of the history through two or three books; and, again, at the conclusion, “the Messiah sets before his disciples in a panoramic vision, the future fates and fortunes of his church, until the end

of the world, and the final consummation of all things:" among which "fates and fortunes," our poet has dutifully contrived that honourable mention should be made of the—

"Two suns of science, seated bright  
On Isis and on Camus' classic banks;"\*

with sundry particulars which, we confess, notwithstanding our own reverence of "*Alma Mater*," have sorely tempted us first to smile and then to be angry. Thus, with the proper number of *twelve books*, and all the externals of a regularly-formed composition, who shall say that this is not an epic poem, "good in law," and complete in all its parts?

"The versification,"—and our authority for this assertion is excellent, as we have the poet's own word for it—

"5. The versification, it is hoped, will be found to be easy and harmonious: that, in so long a work, some absonous lines and metrical deficiencies occur, I have no doubt; but it by no means follows, that a line, which is inharmonious when taken by itself, should prove so when placed in connexion with others; and I am convinced that a well-tuned poetical ear will feel this remark."—*Pref.* pp. xi. xii.

Now, on such a point, we hardly like to differ with a gentleman, who has so long had ample opportunities of forming his opinion; and yet there appear to us a few lines which "halt upon uneven feet," and others which Mr. Wall has forgotten to polish in the ardour of his inspiration. It is still among our recollections, that at school we were occasionally asked to *scan* our verses:—will Mr. Wall do us the favour of *scanning* such lines as—

"With biting desires: here horror and despair."

"A dastardly dissembler to power."—B. vi. l. 185.

"Indicant of the winds, trembles round its point."—B. vi. l. 190.

"Devour it, and burn before thine eyes."—B. xii. l. 356.

"And temple: firebrands, by soldiers thrown."—B. xii. l. 397.

"In superstition, to her deserts withdraws."—B. xii. l. 558.

"The files of war meet, in the dire conflict."—B. xii. l. 667.

"Myriads, locust-like, shall to Asia flow."—B. xii. l. 944.

with many others, which any *single book* of the poem, into which we might happen to dip, would at once present to us. Perhaps, however, our ears are not "*poetical and well-tuned*."

\* We take it for granted that Mr. Ellis Wall is a young man, and will grow wiser, otherwise we should be compelled to deal with him and his poem in a very different manner; and point out how nearly he approaches to the verge of indecency and blasphemy in putting childish compliments to Oxford and Cambridge in the mouth of the Redeemer of the world.

But it is almost a fraud upon our readers to confine them to the spare diet of single lines, when we can place before them so rich a banquet of intellectual delicacies as the following *passages*. Let us remark, before hand, that we choose quotations which have the least bearing upon any peculiar sanctity in the subject-matter.

Many poets have described storms: but Mr. Wall is incomparably great. The vernacular idiom is quite inadequate to the teeming magnificence of his ideas.

“ Now came the tempest on with rushing roar  
Of cutting blasts, that howl'd in hurricanes  
The wrath of nature, and of nature's God!  
From the black bending clouds the sluicy rain  
Pours torrent-streaming down: sharp-smiting sleet,  
Immix'd, adven'd, shooting sagittal war,  
Wing'd on the pinions of the blust'ring blast.  
Dire lightnings play with transitory glare  
In forked strokes, and momentary lights  
Broad flashing flame, that rift the wat'ry clouds  
With igneous fissures, and the murky night  
Illumine: transient glories, swift extinct,  
Just shew th' impending terrors of the scene,  
And leave th' appalled eye in deeper dark.  
And now Heaven's lightning ordnance 'gan roar,  
The gnarring thunders murmuring eftsoons!  
Deep bellow and rebellow crashing round.”

B. v. l. 356—372.

Or take another similar passage, where our poet again leaves competition at an immeasurable distance.

“ And now, as smould'ring by the lightning's blast,  
Above their heads, Heav'n's cloud-capt canopy  
Chang'd ruby red: the blushing dome, behind  
The skirt of darkness gleaming sanguine, shews,  
In gory light with ire celestial swaling,  
Th' apparent night, o'er which scowl'd horror wide.  
Down from their summits high the mountains shake  
Their riven rocks, and into valleys sink  
Precipitant, from Heav'n's wrath fugitive,  
With crashing roar and deaf'ning resonance.  
Earth fears for her inhabitants, and had fled  
(Had Fate's attractive adamantine bonds  
Been frangible) to some remoter space,  
Scar'd at th' imagined sight of Nature's death !”

B. ix. l. 1148—1161.

At other times there is a delightful simplicity. Thus, when the Virgin Mary has been uttering lamentations to St Peter, Mr. Wall adds at the conclusion, “ *So plain'd the fair.*”—p. 439. But, in general, grand and swelling phrases are so congenial to his

peculiar conceptions, that he seldom deviates into a more level style without a certain poorness and tameness, not to say baldness of style, which, we are sure, his own taste would be the first to condemn.

But why detain the reader from Mr. Wall's beauties by our own observations? Let us dash into the work at random, and pull out a few jewels just as they come to hand.

“ Nor less are moral principles from view  
Latent. Primordial foundations firm  
Of truth, and sacred postulates of God,  
Lie shrouded in obnubilating night.”

“ ‘ Now in Bethsaida's faithless town arrived  
Messiah; where some suppliants approach'd,  
Leading a hapless wretch of sight depriv'd.  
Jesus in public view refus'd t' effect  
Such miracle, mid th' unbelieving throng;  
But through the city gate him led, and there  
*Ointed his eyes night-shrouded, and impos'd*  
*Sputation dews.* Straight on the visual ball  
Dawn'd doubtful scenes, and objects indistinct  
Floated along: ‘ *Men walk as trees,*’ (*the wretch*  
*Cried joyous at th' advening view*). This heard,  
Messiah straight a second time his eyes  
Touch'd, and the parting dark shone into day!”

B. viii. l. 135—147.

“ ‘ There clos'd their airy voyage, Satan plac'd  
Messiah, (meekly all his trials borne,)  
High on a cloud-crown'd mountain, that to Heav'n  
Its altitude sublimely rear'd; emerging  
From th' arid desert, midst high rocky hills;  
*As torn and convuls'd from the shatter'd ribs*  
*Of globe terrene.* And there before him plac'd,  
(Part real, part in vision,) glorious scenes.  
Th' earth's atmosphere (*then specular become,*  
*By pow'rs catoptrick and dioptrick join'd,*  
*Reflecting and refracting nature's works*)  
*On light-limn'd mists, circling th' horizon, threw*  
*A spectrum of the world and all her kingdoms!*”

B. vii. l. 225—237.

“ Immediate chanticleer a louder note  
A second time shrill sung.”—B. v. l. 939.

“ In Pilate's legal care  
A noted caitiff lay, in fetters bound,  
Barabbas nam'd. He, *a fell brigand bold,*” &c.

B. viii. l. 638—640.

“ Radbertus first  
Kindles the strife; his monstrous doctrines shame  
The senses, and *time persecution's fire.*”—B. xii. l. 887—889.

Mr. Wall's poem contains, we doubt not, splendid exemplifications of every poetical figure. But alliteration is his favourite. Where, indeed, shall we find any bard, in any language, who makes use so skilfully or so frequently of

“ Apt alliteration's artful aid.”

A few instances will suffice.

“ Their Master's form was glorious transfigur'd  
To shape and splendour of Heav'n's habitants !  
His beamy face darted celestial rays,  
As when o'er th' Earth dazes the cloudless sun,  
Burnish'd with brilliancy and lustre's life.  
His vestments, pierc'd with emanative beams,  
Whiten'd to light, and dazzled into day !  
Candid as driven snow, and whiter far  
Than fuller's art can bleach an earthly vest :  
While shining argent clouds blaz'd blinding round,  
And downward rain'd a radiant storm of rays !  
When, lo ! two prophets old, in glitt'ring guise,” &c. &c. &c.  
B. viii. l. 155—166.

But once more we must give the pearls without attempting to string them.

“ There was found  
A double livid liver, whose one lobe  
Lusorious leap'd.”—p. 339.

“ Bick'ring flame  
Flagrates th' expiring world.”—p. 511.

“ And onward hal'd  
With stagg'ring steps, slidd'ring o'er slipp'ry ground.”—p. 202.  
“ So he. Whereat th' old man, with threat'ning look,  
Relucent grown from dark, that instant seiz'd,  
With gryphon's gripe, the passive Son of God,  
And soar'd with him, cloud-high, shot into air.”—  
B. vii. l. 180—183.

“ Then day shall shine on those who sit in night  
Pernicious : Death's death die, and life's life live.”—  
B. ix. l. 968—969.

“ The gorgeous gallantries of courts and cities,  
Pass'd by in stately gait. There syren forms  
Sang their deceptive songs, and from swift feet  
Sparkling with spangled gems dropt down a dance,  
And floated gay o'er the flow'r-liv'ried sward.”  
B. vii. l. 49—53.

We are informed of a “ wily spider,” that

“ He weaves fresh filmy fetters, tangles twines.”—B. iii. l. 267.

So also we have “ lucent lights,” and “ linear light,” and “ virent vesture,” and “ sandall'd sounds,” and “ tiny tones,” and “ *hallel* hymns,” and “ horrent hair,” and “ jagged jaws,” and

"difficultly died," "rapid Rome's legions," and "Mnemonic herb of Hymen," and a whole galaxy of stars equally brilliant.

From these citations our readers cannot fail to have perceived the affluence of speech, as well as the affluence of imagery, which renders Mr. Wall pre-eminent among poets.

It was said of Pope, if we remember rightly, that if his epic had not been burned, it would probably have enriched the English language with many new and beautiful expressions. How thankful ought we to be, that no sacrilegious flames have consumed the labours of Mr. Wall! *He* is, assuredly, the king of the Dictionary: and, by the omission of a single letter, we may apply to him the celebrated compliment, and say that he has

"Exhausted *words*, and then imagin'd new."

Our tongue is certainly indebted to him for many original terms of much nobler sound, and more magnificent dimensions than the vulgar Saxon, which we are in the habit of using. We recommend the following (and the catalogue might be infinitely enlarged) to any gentleman or lady who wishes to make additions to a "cabinet of curiosities;"—"crescive," "croisoidal," "declivous," "ramous," "fuscous," "nocent," "parle," "maffled," "sciential," "intelligential," "inflesht," "advesperating," "ignivomous," "ventigenous," "altivolant," "ingustible," "advenes," "elutes," "aculeate," "cruentate," "spumy," "magnifick," "theorick," "indesinently," *cum multis aliis*, as see the poem itself *passim*.

Many of these expressions Mr. Wall has of course derived from his acquaintance with the poets of classical antiquity. In the same way we may account for the otherwise strange anomaly that "Flora," and "Aurora," and "Phœbus," and "Bacchus," and "Tethys' lap," and "*Cynthia* these of primary orbit," &c., are occasionally found figuring among the events and personages of the New Testament; and that the Virgin Mary is visited with "sweetest dreams from *Somnus' bower*:" and that we have a regular invocation, introductory of some of the most solemn occurrences, to

"Clio, Historic Muse, and daughter fair  
Of Jove, and of Mnemosyne."

And again, hence it is, that, in the tenth book, we have a description of the infernal regions, written in a more subdued and tranquil style than is usual with Mr. Wall; inasmuch as it happens to be an echo, or a translation, of different parts of Virgil and Lucretius.

But we have done. If, after all these extracts, our readers do not immediately set forth to purchase Mr. Wall's production, the fault is not ours. The only difficulty which presents itself to our



minds is this : that, if they *should* purchase this present volume, they will probably have to purchase two others in the spring of 1834. For Mr. Wall says in his preface, p. xiii.

“ It was my intention to accompany the poem with historical and critical notes from the writings of the Christian fathers, commentators, and others whose works I had perused, with a view in some degree to the present publication ; but finding that so extensive a plan would swell the work to two, or possibly three, octavo volumes, without any greater probability of success, it has been thought preferable to present the text only to the public, that its reception might either encourage or discountenance the further prosecution of my undertaking.”

We shall ourselves be looking out with eager expectation : and yet Mr. Wall's course is, perhaps, judicious ; as when we think of the specific gravity of the poem, we are not quite sure that, besides swimming upon the stream of public favour itself, it would have been able to float and buoy up two volumes of notes. And why, in fact, should Mr. Wall trouble himself with such matters ? These are not tasks which belong to men of original and poetic genius. Commentators, doubtless, will arise in after ages, who will do justice to his text. We say in after ages : for, alas ! of the present age we despair. Milton, we verily believe, would in our days be treated with a more scurvy contumely than awaited him in the times of which it is the fashion to complain : and, instead of obtaining twenty pounds for “ *Paradise Lost*,” we much question whether, if he were now alive, he would find a bookseller to take the risk of the publication. If Mr. Wall, therefore, should not meet his deserts ; if his lofty ambition should be disappointed ; let him console himself with this recollection, that his fate is the common fate of the highest order of talents : and for our own parts we shall only say of him, if there is any failure of success,

“ *Magnis tamen excidit ausis.*”

But enough of this. Let us add two words in a graver tone. We are aware that we may have thrown ourselves open to an accusation from which we should recoil with the deepest feelings of annoyance, by speaking with levity of a poem, of which the subject is “ *Christ crucified*.” Heaven forbid that we should speak on sacred subjects with levity and ridicule ; but it is a different thing, we trust, to speak with ridicule of the manner in which sacred subjects are handled. Indeed, we frankly confess our desire to discountenance and put down Epic Poems on divine themes, more especially such poems as it is impossible to read through without the involuntary excitement of feelings which ought never to be awakened under such circumstances.

Upon the matter of epic poetry in general, our opinions, we



fear, are in many respects heretical; but we need not put them forth, as we would now just touch upon a point far more important than any topics of literary taste. Of such a nature is our objection to *sacred* epics or *sacred* dramas, that is, epic or dramatic poems which are founded on the Bible; and the objection comes upon us with a tenfold strength, when they relate to the Fall or Redemption of Mankind. These things are too holy for poetical amplification, and too awful for poetical embellishment. *All* such poems, we think, are in themselves a *mistake*. We *feel* the mistake when we take up such productions as the "Death of Abel," or Klopstock's "Messiah," or Kirke White's "Christiad," or any other work of the same class. We feel it even in the case of Milton with regard to "Paradise Lost," and much more to "Paradise Regained," and in some degree, perhaps, to the "Samson Agonistes." The majesty of the execution cannot reconcile us to the design. Our opinion, in fact, is, that it would be better to confine sacred poetry to compositions, and, for the most part, *short* compositions, which breathe the spirit of personal devotion, and express the fervour of individual feelings and aspirations to the sovereignty of heaven. *Here* the Bible is itself full of the most exquisite and perfect models. But we deny the whole *principle* of narrative poems, which merely take the oracles of God for the ground-work of their story. Upon such subjects no man can write up to our conceptions of religious sublimity; and, what is far more, no man can write in any way without confusing our ideas of religious truth. Of all incongruous, offensive, and painful mixtures, the mixture of Divine Revelation and human invention—of sacred history and poetical fiction—in a word, of Scripture and fable—is to our minds the most incongruous and most offensive and most painful in the world.

On this account our strictures upon Mr. Wall have taken a more caustic tone than we might otherwise have assumed. We give him credit for excellent intentions; but credit for excellent intentions, we know well, will not satisfy a man who aspires to wear the laurel crown of Homer and Milton; we do not deny to him the possession of some talents, but we think that he has managed to render them altogether useless, and occasionally somewhat ridiculous;\* we do not deny to him the praise of some in-

\* In truth, we are more inclined to laugh at Mr. Wall, because he has taken such excessive pains to *make himself* ridiculous. In the few lucid intervals, when he foregoes or forgets his bombastic and pedantic extravagances, and, instead of straining after effect and thinking to outsoar all possible rivalry, is content with chasteness and sobriety of style, his lines are not without their elegance, and single expressions of real beauty and poetry are occasionally interspersed. We here subjoin one short passage by way of specimen:—

"Hypocrisy! how speciously she roams  
The world around, muffled in borrow'd vests!

dustry and research, but we think that his research and his industry have been sadly misemployed; and we do trust that he will forthwith betake him to some other occupation, less exceptionable in a religious point of view, and more profitable or more hopeful in a worldly point of view, than the composition of epic poems on such subjects as "Christ Crucified."

Outweeps the weeping of sincerity ;  
 Outdoes the doings of true charity ;  
 Outflies the zeal of purest piety ;  
 Awhile, when eyes are on her, wears her mask,  
 Dropt, with a sneer at man's credulity,  
 When none is nigh, save God, the deed to note."—B. ii. l. 246—253.

Yet even this favourable instance is marred by the abominable alliteration at the end.

ART. III.—*Memoirs of the Court of King Charles the First.* By Lucy Aikin. 2 vols. 8vo. Longman and Co. London, 1833.

THE title of this book will certainly disappoint every reader who expects to find in it any details respecting the private life of Charles the First; the gossip of his court; or the manners of the lords and ladies who directed its fashions or influenced its politics. Miss Aikin has only produced an historical abridgment of the civil war; written, upon the whole, in a correct and lively style, but presenting no traces of accurate research or deep meditation. Her creed, as a politician, too, is made manifest in every page. Less passionate than Mrs. Macauley, she is not more favourable to the unfortunate king; less philosophical than Laing, she is equally severe in her censures on the vices of tyrants and the abuse of delegated power; less declamatory than Brodie, she is not more just in her conclusions relative to the motives of the principal actors in the great national drama; and less open than Godwin in her hostility to the royalists, she is not more sparing in her invectives, bitterness and sarcasm. In a word, she seems to have written under a decided bias towards what is esteemed the popular interest: And, as always happens in similar cases, she has not hesitated to twist facts so as to answer her purpose; to select such anecdotes as might darken the reputation of Charles and his household; to pass slightly over all extenuating circumstances; and, generally, to sum up the historical evidence with so partial an intent as to lead the judgment of her readers to the least merciful verdict.

At the distance of two hundred years, we are still too near the days when the son of James the First ascended the throne, to reason with entire impartiality on the great principles and events which have conferred on his reign such an immeasurable import-

ance. The epoch of human society, which at that period assumed in England its peculiar form and character, has not yet run its full course. The great elements, which then began to develop their force and activity, have not yet subsided into any fixed or permanent shape. The political caldron, which then commenced its ebullition, has not hitherto thrown all its scum to the top. We are still under the influence of causes which were then first seen to operate; and are therefore to a certain extent disqualified for examining into their nature and anticipating their results.

What might have been deduced from theory on this subject, is found completely substantiated by facts; for, in this section of British history, party-feeling is still so vehemently excited that it is vain to look among our contemporaries for a narrative worthy of entire confidence. The mutual recriminations and reciprocal calumnies which were launched against each other by the monarchist and the commonwealth's man, have been transmitted to our own times; the Whig and the Tory now infuse into their respective works the bitter spirit which agitated the controversies of a former age; and it cannot be concealed that the political antagonists of the present day equal the most noted of their predecessors in their fierce animosities, as well as in the narrowness of their views.

It has been often remarked that the French Revolution is an illustration of the same principles which produced the English, only modified by the different circumstances of the two nations in point of wealth and civil rights, at the era when they respectively started in the race of freedom. Guizot, in his history of the latter event, observes that such is the analogy of the two revolutions that the first could never have been perfectly understood had not the second burst forth. Nor has the impatient spirit of innovation been yet either satiated or conciliated. The shades of Prynne and Mirabeau seem to hover over the meetings and to animate the counsels of the people on either side of the channel; inspiring contempt for every institution older than themselves, and teaching the multitude to connect all their hopes of improvement with the perpetration of the most hazardous changes. The present age is, therefore, deeply interested in all discussions that promise to throw even the faintest light on those secret springs, by the action of which the political machine is so frequently disturbed. We become disposed to the most serious reflexion on the origin of causes, which are periodically followed by effects so appalling and apparently unavoidable. We listen with the profoundest interest to every one who undertakes to explain the rise of that tremendous tide which ever and anon threatens to inundate the dry land, and subject us once more to the alarms and misery of an universal deluge.

But, generally speaking, we are compelled to rest satisfied with insulated facts in place of connected principles; and we must add that, unless we can put ourselves under the guidance of a very sage and dispassionate writer, the literal statement is more valuable than the laboured commentary. When reason has secured the dominion of the author's mind, and represses the risings of a peevish temper and a factious spirit, we are indifferent as to the association from which he takes his name, or the banner under which he professes to serve. We are equally delighted with the reflections of Hume and D'Israeli, of Hallam and M'Intosh; because, on most occasions, these historians address the understanding rather than the spleen, and try to gain our suffrage by the fair and honourable canvas of distinct argument. The bias is indeed manifest; no concealment is thrown over the several objects which they are desirous to accomplish; but, on the other hand, the means employed are perfectly legitimate; there are no poisoned weapons to be apprehended, no stratagem to be feared, and no arts, beyond those of a cunning rhetoric, to call for our vigilance. Our complaints and aversion are solely directed against that malignity which attempts to compass its paltry ends by tampering with records, corrupting authorities, insinuating motives which an examination of facts is not found to warrant; and, above all, by exciting in the mind of the reader suspicions against those whom the author has not courage to attack.

The true history of the first Charles has an intimate connexion with the great events which marked the current of English politics, from the accession of Henry Tudor down to the demise of James. The storm which overthrew the throne, at the middle of the seventeenth century, had been rising in the air and gradually gathering strength for more than a hundred and fifty years. Men had become conscious of certain powers which refused to be any longer repressed or directed; they began to dream of rights which, they readily induced themselves to believe, had been too long withheld; they felt, for the first time, the pressure of burdens which they now thought it unworthy of freemen to bear; and they aspired to the enjoyment of privileges which, they fondly imagined, their mere birth in a land devoted to liberty entitled them to claim.

The increase of knowledge and property among the commons, at the period just indicated, was the principal agent which effected, by a gradual but irresistible operation, the improvement of the constitution and the enlargement of freedom. At a still earlier date, indeed, the theory of government had attained to considerable perfection; for the spirit of the feudal system, under which the forms of political society were originally established in

this country, was far from being inconsistent with the claims of personal liberty in all classes, except, perhaps, the very lowest. In opposition to the weak though arbitrary administration of Henry the Third, permission was extorted from the crown to elect and return to Parliament two knights for each shire, two citizens for each city, two burgesses for each borough, and two barons for each cinque port, to represent the community at large. The following reigns, too, were distinguished by some important accessions to popular privileges ; and, if we might judge of the extent of liberty enjoyed by the means and precautions which were used for its support, there would be no rashness in asserting that the frame of English law had already embodied the leading principles of a free constitution.

But amidst the confusion of the frequent wars in which the country was engaged, and the turbulence of the more powerful barons, the voice of law could not be heard, so, at least, as to extend its protection to the lower orders of the people ; and it was not until the successful pursuits of agriculture and commerce had raised the inhabitants of the maritime counties in the scale of political weight and intelligence that the real benefits of the constitution began to be enjoyed. Such is the power of that curiosity which is naturally inherent to the human mind, that, whenever men have the means of information placed within their reach, they are found to examine and compare ; and from that moment the grosser corruptions of national policy can only be maintained by force, or by the dread of greater evils which would attend their instant removal. It accordingly deserves notice that, so early as the reign of Henry the Fifth, “ the times were now come  
“ about when light began to spring forth, conscience to bestir  
“ itself, and men to study the Scriptures. This was imputed to  
“ the idleness and carelessness of the clergy, who suffered the minds  
“ of young scholars to luxuriate into errors of divinity, for want  
“ of putting them on to other learning, by preferring those that  
“ were deserving. The Convocation taking this into consideration  
“ do decree that no person shall exercise any jurisdiction in any  
“ office, as vicar-general, commissary, or official, unless he shall  
“ first in the University have taken degrees in the *civil* or *canon*  
“ laws. A shrewd trick this was to stop the growth of the study  
“ of divinity and Wickliff’s way, and to embellish men’s minds  
“ with a kind of learning that may gain them preferment, or at  
“ least an opinion of abilities beyond the common strain, and  
“ dangerous to be meddled with.”\*

\* Bacon’s Discourses, Part II.

Such expedients for perpetuating the reign of ignorance cannot be attended with much success, and will never be resorted to by those who have learned to read the "signs of the times." The devices of the clergy in the fifteenth century bore some resemblance to the inconsiderate resolution of James and his son Charles, who, when they found their subjects becoming more than usually serious, gave orders to republish the Book of Sports. In both cases, we perceive a degree of practical wisdom equal to that of men who, in order to prolong the duration of night, should at the dawn of day, desire the windows to be curtained and additional candles to be brought in. More intelligent or vigilant rulers would, in either instance, have studied the indications of a new era about to open upon the theological and political world, and prepared themselves for the exertions to which they might be called, whether to obviate or to satisfy its claims.

The progress of liberty in England was checked in no small measure by the immense power acquired for the crown by Henry the Seventh, and by the practical despotism of his son and successor. The latter, who found the nobles weakened by their mutual strife, and the people exhausted by protracted wars, conducted his government on the most arbitrary principles; showing himself either ignorant or indifferent in respect to all the statutes that had ever been enacted for the protection of individual freedom. Elizabeth, inheriting much of her father's spirit, trode in his footsteps, so far as the improved condition of her subjects would permit. In the days of this queen, the claims of the prerogative were as high, and the power of Parliament as low as during the reign of the imperious Henry.

But, as we have elsewhere observed, both the father and daughter sought a cover for their attacks on the constitution, by acting in apparent concert with the two branches of the legislature. At the same time, nothing is more obvious than that the regal power was all the while exercised in so high and arbitrary a manner as, in fact, to destroy the belief that the people had any claim to the benefits of a free government. Even the language of Parliament itself, with the decrees of lawyers and the doctrines of divines, ran decidedly in favour of an unlimited prerogative. The "crown" had been declared supreme, and to have the chief government "of all estates of this realm, and in all causes." The first of the Stuarts, therefore, reasoned with perfect accuracy upon the statutes and precedents with which the practice of a hundred years had supplied him, when he declared the King of England to be above all law. Even Elizabeth, who was not so much disposed to prate about abstract right, occasionally checked her Parliaments by reminding them that it was not their part to meddle with



what concerned the prerogative royal, and the high points of government.\*

The dangers which assailed the church from the two opposite points of the theological horizon, the papists and the puritans, had led to a variety of curious speculations on the origin of kingly power, whether applied to church or state. The supremacy of the crown, however, so frequently asserted in those days, had no respect to any privilege of dispensing with the laws of the land, but merely announced the independence of the kingdom, with regard to all foreign potentates, whether civil or ecclesiastical. The *Divine right* claimed for the hereditary sovereigns of England, was urged in opposition to the Jesuits, who, to weaken the sentiment of allegiance to an heretical prince, taught, throughout the whole nation, that royal authority had no spiritual sanction, but originated exclusively in the will of the people. The puritans, though entertaining very different views, coincided with the Romish priests in the doctrine now mentioned; and hence, as the foundation of the throne seemed about to be shaken by the prevalence of an opinion so formidable to the peculiar interests of the queen, the clergy laboured to prove, that, all regular power being of God, kings reign by his appointment and as his vice-gerents. It is no wonder, therefore, that James, who was at all times better fitted for adjusting the terms of an argument than for pursuing the more active duties of the regal office, should have indulged his imagination in the unrestrained exercise of theoretical despotism in both divisions of his kingdom. In practice, he was a very mild ruler, hardly ever incurring blame except for his lenity towards the Roman Catholics, against whom he was loath to execute in their full severity the dreadful provisions of the penal laws, by which Parliament had deemed it necessary to guard the Protestant faith.

The period at which the sceptre of Great Britain fell into the hands of Charles, required either a sovereign of great warlike talents and resolution, who would have found employment for the growing wealth and rising spirit of his people, or one possessing much political wisdom, who could have preserved the balance of the ancient constitution, without sacrificing any part of the prerogative indispensably requisite for the vigour of his administration. The young king unfortunately inherited a set of maxims which, though perfectly consistent with the actual government of the country during a century and a half, were really at variance with the true spirit of constitutional law, as well as with the enlarged views of the greater number of his subjects. He saw not

\* British Critic, No. XX: p. 396.



that the political machinery of the state was becoming more and more unfitted for the purposes which it was meant to serve; and that, in order to be adapted to the wants or fancies of his age, it must undergo a slight process of remodelling under the eye of the national representatives.

Whether in the position which Charles was doomed to occupy, viewed in reference to the spirit of the times, it would have been possible to negotiate such a treaty with the popular party as would at once have satisfied their demands, and secured for the executive the necessary degree of power, is a question which experience has not even yet enabled us to solve. The history of the French revolution does not contribute to strengthen the belief that concessions, however extensive, will appease the ravenous appetite for innovation. Even in our own country, where there was less ground for complaint, the demands of the parliamentarians were at length carried so far as to indicate, in the least ambiguous manner possible, that the crown was considered as a mere incumbrance. It is true, as Clarendon remarks, that the majority of the members of the House of Commons had originally no mind to break the peace of the kingdom, or to make any considerable alteration in the government of Church and State. But these moderate views proved no security to the constitution. For, he adds, all inventions were set on foot from the beginning to work on them and corrupt them by suggestions of the dangers which threatened all that was precious to the subject in their liberty and their property; and then, by infusing terrible apprehensions into some, and by working on the fears of others, the ambitious demagogues induced them to become their tools, and, in the end, to carry matters much farther than had been intended by the first advocates of freedom.

It has, indeed, been justly observed, that the course of events had rendered necessary a great change in the condition of mankind throughout Europe; for the political system was constructed on a scale which bore no relation to the increased and complicated interests of society. The impending revolution, therefore, was not destined to be only a partial change, as had sometimes happened when the rule and power were merely transferred, for a space, to the nobles, or to the hierarchy, or to the absolute sovereign. Nor was it to be only a temporary concession to the excited desires of the people; an alteration which simply reduced the privileges of one class, and relieved the miseries of another. But, in its wide pretensions, it implied a total change of all the acknowledged principles of human action. It contradicted the fundamental doctrines of political jurisprudence as then received throughout the great European monarchies. It undertook to de-

fine new orders in social life, to create new rights, and to open up new prospects.

It was long doubtful, as D'Israeli remarks, in which country the great revolution was to commence. The minority of Louis the Thirteenth exhibits, in the ambition of the turbulent princes of France, and in the republican spirit of the Duc de Rohan and the Hugonots, some faint outlines of the revolution under our Charles the First, which it had preceded. In an ingenious parallel, we might detect some very apt resemblances. But there were peculiar reasons which rendered it more than probable that the important struggle would commence in England. The establishment of the reformed faith had habituated our countrymen to a greater freedom of inquiry than their neighbours yet possessed; while a long and luxurious peace had raised up among the commons a new class of men, enjoying a degree of weight and influence in the nation, to which their rank in the state had never before entitled them.\*

If we weigh well the facts now stated, we shall be satisfied that no one can read with advantage a life of Charles the First, who has not studied carefully the temper and projects of the age in which his lot was cast; and, further, that no one can do justice to the motives on which he professed to act, who has not made himself acquainted with the maxims on which all European governments were at that time administered. To try the unfortunate king at the tribunal of modern principles, is not less absurd than it is cruel and unjust; and yet, in the popular biographies of that monarch, nothing is more common than to place his conduct in the same light in which we should examine the proceedings of the several princes of the Hanoverian dynasty. If a similar standard were applied to the characters of even the greatest statesmen, lawyers, and divines, who flourished before the era of the Commonwealth, we should find them extremely deficient in many of those qualities which, in our days, constitute the excellence of public men.

Charles, the second son of James the First, was born at Dunfermline, in Scotland, on the 9th of November, 1600. Being a weak child, his baptism was hastened, and was solemnized in the presence of the Prince of Rohan and his brother Soubise, of whom the former is well known as the leader of the French Hugonots. His constitution improved as he advanced in the years of boyhood, and he afterwards exhibited considerable activity in the sports and exercises which belong to youth. He still laboured, however, under a natural defect, which proved the

\* D'Israeli's Commentaries on the Life and Reign of Charles the First, vol. i. pp. 2, 3.

source of no small inconvenience when he ascended the throne; namely, an impediment in his speech, which, it is said, was wont chiefly to manifest itself whenever he became earnest in discourse, and is thought to have in some measure given rise to that taciturnity for which he was remarkable. It was in his fifth year that he was created Duke of York, and invested with the insignia of the Bath; on which occasion twelve young noblemen, as companions, were raised to the same dignity.

Miss Aiken has collected from the several writers of his early life, that he was "blemished with a supposed obstinacy;" and also, that the weakness of his body in childhood inclined him to retirement; and that, as the imperfection of his utterance rendered discourse unpleasant, he was "suspected to be somewhat perverse." She has likewise discovered that he was noted by his mother and others who were about him, "to be very wilful and obstinate;" and that the old Scotch lady, his nurse, was wont to affirm so much; and that he was of a "very evil nature even in his infancy;" and that the lady who afterwards took charge of him cannot deny but that he was beyond measure "wilful and unthankful."

Such qualities constitute a good foundation for the structure which the ingenious authoress had resolved to erect. Her scheme of history required that Charles should be represented as wilful, obstinate, and perverse; and she therefore culls from the angry expressions of cross nurses a number of unfavourable epithets wherewith to shade his opening character and to create a prejudice in the mind of the reader. What inferences can be drawn from the temper of a sickly child, under three years of age!

It is admitted that, as he advanced in age, other qualities began to unfold themselves which were observed with approbation and respect. His father attempted to inspire him with the love of literature, on the honours of which he himself placed the greatest value. Nor did the young duke disappoint the paternal cares which were lavished on him; for we find that, at the age of ten, he could go through all the forms of a regular disputation on theology, and display some acquaintance with the polemics which exercised the ingenuity of those times. There was not, in fact, any royal family then in Europe which could equal the English court in the early promise put forth by its well educated princes. James directed an unwearied attention to the improvement of his children, in manners as well as in intellectual accomplishments; and the fruits of his anxiety appeared to great advantage in the acquirements of Henry, of Charles, and even of Elizabeth, the future queen of Bohemia. We are told that Jonson the poet, struck with the amiable zeal of the king in discharging these first

duties of a parent, addressed him in the following rather familiar terms, though veiled under the disguise of a masque :

“ You are an honest, good man, and have care of your bairns ! ”

It is further related that the children of James were well instructed in music and dancing ; and that his majesty desired them to keep up their dancing privately, though they should whistle and sing to one another for music. To provoke his eldest son to apply more closely to his studies, he told him that his brother Charles, who already loved his books, would prove more able in the management of affairs than he, who consumed the greater part of the day in the tilt yard, and passionately pursued his military exercises. This fatherly admonition was received in silence ; but when his tutor, Sir Abraham Newton, reiterated the king's reprimand, the prince asked whether he really thought that his brother would prove a good scholar. The knight replied in the affirmative. “ Then,” exclaimed Henry, “ will I make him Archbishop of Canterbury.”

At all events, it is manifest that a spark of rivalry had been early kindled between the brothers ; and the scholarship of the youngest had been so frequently employed to stimulate the industry of the heir apparent, that the latter thought himself justified in taking a good natured revenge. One day the two princes, with Doctor Abbot, and other noblemen, were waiting in the privy chamber for an audience. Henry, in allusion to Charles's proficiency in his studies, placed the primate's cap on his head, observing that, “ if he continued a good boy, and followed his books, he would in due time make him Archbishop of Canterbury.” The little duke indignantly flung down the cap and trampled on it. He had heard, it would seem, too often of the future archbishopric, and the taunts from his heroic brother stung him into an ebullition of momentary resentment.

From this anecdote of the royal boys, as Mr. D'Israeli reminds his readers, their contemporaries, according to the taste of the times, draw the most opposite inferences. One detects a mystical presage of the fall of episcopacy under the administration of Charles ; to another it seemed peculiarly ominous of the fall of the archbishop himself, who was afterwards suspended from his office by the displeasure of his sovereign ; a third, with the malignity of a republican, accepts it as an evidence of the latent sullenness and obstinacy of the future monarch ; while an ultra royalist, in the depth of his wisdom, discovers in it a sign of great bigness of spirit, and a humour that did not love jesting or levity.

The fraternal intercourse between the sons of James was however rarely interrupted. There are still extant several familiar

notes written in English, French, and Latin, from the Duke Charles to Prince Henry; the amusement, perhaps of the hour, or the playful exercises of his studies. "Sweet, sweet brother, I thank you for your letter. I will give any thing I have to you, but my toys and my books."\*

When Charles, upon the death of his brother, found himself the heir of the crown, he saw the propriety of turning his attention to those harder pursuits which he had hitherto avoided; and it was not long before he became an adept in most of the accomplishments valued by the gentlemen of the age. By such active sports, too, he greatly invigorated his frame. Hence, he was described by one of his contemporaries as a "laborious fieldsman;" and another tells us that he was thought to be the most dexterous manager of the great horse of any man in the three nations, and a sharp marksman.

At the age of sixteen he was created Prince of Wales, and surrounded with a court; but he did not, as sometimes happens, avail himself of the power or influence thereby acquired to disturb his father's government. On the contrary, he continued to pursue the studies to which his earlier youth was attached, and to increase those stores of knowledge on which his first reputation was founded. So extensive, indeed, were his acquirements in the fine arts, that "he thought, if driven by necessity, he could get his living" by practising some one of them as a common trade. In a similar style of conversation, he is said to have declared that if he were compelled to take any particular profession for a livelihood, he could not be a lawyer; for, said he, "I cannot defend a bad cause, nor yield in a good one"—a principle on which the whole course of his future life was shaped. Laud, on whose authority the last anecdote is given, added what has been considered an ill-omened wish, "that he might *thus* for ever prosper in his great affairs!"

It is readily admitted, even by those least friendly to Charles, that he gave all the encouragement in his power to learning and science. The civil dissensions, which embittered his reign, cut short many fair designs for the embellishment of social life, and deprived many eminent scholars and distinguished artists of their most munificent patron and best friend. A lively impulse had, however, been given to taste and the fine arts; and notwithstanding the temporary check they sustained, no ground was permanently lost. Manners had been refined and civilized; the nobler springs of thought and action had been moved; and a race of men was formed, who carried into civil war itself principles and

\* D'Israeli, vol. i. p. 16, &c.

feelings which powerfully restrained its license, and deprived it in a great measure of its usual ferocity.

“ Early in the reign the House of Lords had appointed a committee, of which the Duke of Buckingham was a member, to inquire into the state of the public schools, and the method of the education pursued in them. From this investigation seems to have sprung an academy established in London, under the title of *Museum Minervæ*, by the royal patent granted to Sir Francis Kynaston, or Kingston, an esquire of the body, who was appointed its regent. In conformity with the spirit of the age, none were to be admitted as students but such as could prove themselves gentlemen by birth. Many professors were appointed, and their courses embraced philosophy, geometry, astronomy, medicine, music, languages, painting, architecture, riding, fortification, antiquities, and the study of medals. A library, a museum, philosophical apparatus, and a collection of paintings, statues and antiques were attached to the college. Owing to the state of the king's affairs, the design was never carried into full effect. About the period of Charles's death, that noted projector, Sir Balthazar Gerbier, made an effort, however, either to revive this scheme, or establish something similar; but he appears to have undertaken to instruct in all branches himself. His lectures ‘on the art of well-speaking’ attracted the sarcastic notice of Butler. One of them was announced as ‘designed for the ladies and honourable women of this nation’—the first instance probably in this country of a popular lecture addressed to females.”

It is well observed by Rapin, that it is no easy matter to give a just and exact character of Charles amidst the excessive commendations bestowed on him by some, and the calumnies where-with others have attempted to blacken his reputation. If the parties born in his reign had died with him, as another author observes, we might find in the histories of that time, composed after the troubles were terminated, an impartiality which would aid us in forming a true judgment of this prince's character; but the same parties continuing in the following reigns with a mutual animosity, it may be safely averred there is no English historian impartial on this subject. Some have had no other view than to vindicate the king; and others, whose aim was to justify the parliament, could not do so without calumniating the monarch, and rendering him odious.\*

Indeed it is not possible to obtain a correct view of the qualities which distinguished the mind of Charles; for it has been assumed by those writers who, notwithstanding their utmost efforts, have been unable to make him appear despicable, that the public and private character of the monarch are totally unconnected. But it is as impossible to form a just conception of the character of a king, without becoming acquainted with his

\* Fellows's *Historical Sketch of Charles the First*, p. 61.



private history, as it is to form a just conception of the individual, without becoming acquainted with the times in which he lived. It is not, therefore, surprising that those who hold the resolution of examining into the private character of Charles I. apart from his public one, should judge of the latter, not as displayed in the seventeenth century, but as if the monarch had lived and acted under their own eyes in the nineteenth.

In the opinion of a candid and able historian, the characteristics of Charles's mind were inflexible firmness, constancy of purpose, perseverance to obtain his object, and fortitude to suffer for it;—and these are the elements which form the beautiful unity of a strong character. We should, however, observe that this strength of character is not necessarily associated with the most comprehensive understanding, any more than the most comprehensive understanding is necessarily supported by this moral force. Hence, the stronger the character of the man, the stronger may be its errors; and thus its very strength may become its greatest infirmity. In speculating upon the Life of this unfortunate ruler, through all the stages of his varied existence from the throne to the scaffold, we may discover the same intellectual and moral being. Depressed by fortune beneath the humblest of his people, the king himself remained unchanged; and whether we come to reproach or to sympathise, something of pity and terror must blend with the story of a noble mind wrestling with an unconquerable fate.\*

Authorized by the doctrines of the age, by his education, and by the natural gravity of his own mind, to ascend the throne as the anointed of Heaven, it was his doom to see the *jus divinum* of his crown trampled upon, the might of his magnificent hierarchy overwhelmed, the civil institutions of his kingdom swept away, all that he deemed sacred profaned, and everything subverted which he had considered the most firmly established; while, in their stead, he beheld new doctrines and new practices introduced, alien to his habits and startling to his imagination. In this unparalleled state of affairs, however, the courage of Charles did not quail. On the contrary, throughout the long, fearful, and dubious conflict, he uniformly appears the most resolute and interesting personage that mixes in the scene. When the struggle was over, the king came forward and closed his career by a memorable death; and while he was covered with execration and obloquy as the Tyrant by one faction, he was hailed as the Martyr by the tears of the greater part of the nation. It is difficult to believe that the man who thus lived and thus died could have been the individual whom it has always been the supposed inte-

\* D'Israeli, vol. i. p. 6.



rest of a successful party to represent him. Tyrant and martyr are rarer characters than mankind are accustomed to consider them; and they often vanish before the impartial student, who, searching neither for the one nor the other, dares to seek in history for the true lineaments of the sovereign who disputed the rights which his people claimed, and at length fell by their hands.

Considering that James saw very clearly the numerous disadvantages which might arise from the union of his son with a Catholic princess, it is surprising that he should have set his heart so earnestly on a matrimonial connection with Spain, at that time one of the most powerful and bigoted countries in Europe. It was one of his maxims, wiser perhaps than some others which he took greater care to promulgate, that the King of England should have a wife of the same religion with himself, by which means many fears would be allayed, and many disputes avoided. "Discrepancy in matters of faith," said he, "produces discrepancy in all other matters, and the dissension of your divines will create discord among the people, following the example derived from yourselves." "*Discrepans religio discrepantes semper mores secum introducit; et dissentio vestrorum theologorum discordiam etiam in populo gignit, dum a vobis ipsi exemplum sumunt.*"\*

The marriage with a daughter of France, which actually took place, was far from being propitious either to the domestic peace of Charles, or to the welfare of his kingdom. The train of priests and other spiritual dependents, whom Henrietta Maria brought with her to the court of her husband, gave great uneasiness to himself, as well as offence to the public; and it admits of little doubt, that, if he had not dismissed them of his own accord, the parliament would have interposed its authority or advice to rid the land of a grievance which it bore so impatiently.

Miss Aiken has collected some notices relative to the introduction of the young queen, which, as they are new to the general reader, can hardly fail to be interesting. At Amiens, where Mary de' Medici took leave of her daughter, she presented her with a letter in her own name and handwriting, but of which Richelieu was the real author. This document has fortunately been preserved to the present time, and is on many accounts very curious and important.

"After some general exhortations to piety and devotion, and customary phrases on the nothingness of this world compared with eternity, the princess is enjoined to recollect that she is a daughter of the Church, and that this is the most exalted title she can ever bear; and to pray constantly that the precious gifts of faith and grace may be preserved to her, and that she may rather lose her life than fall from them. She is

\* Basilikon Doron, p. 83.

reminded of the devotion of her ancestor St. Louis, and exhorted to be, like him, firm and zealous in her religion, and never to listen to anything, nor suffer anything to be said in her presence, contrary to the faith. 'We have the promise,' it is added, 'of the late King of Great Britain, and of the king his son, that such things shall not be said; but, on your part, you must show so firm a resolution, and such severity on this point, that any one making such an attempt may perceive at once that you cannot endure such license. Your zeal and courage will be properly exerted on this matter; and with the knowledge you possess of everything necessary to your salvation, your humility will be approved if you shut your ears against all discourse on religion, leaving the Church to speak for you.' To confirm her faith, she is recommended to open her mind to those who have the care of her conscience, to frequent the sacraments, and to communicate on the first Sunday of every month, and at all the feasts of Jesus Christ and of his holy mother, to whom, as being named after her, she is exhorted to pay a peculiar devotion.

"The next duties enjoined upon her, respect the Catholic subjects of her husband, whom she is so to patronize with him, that they may not relapse into the misery whence her marriage had rescued them: she is to be to them another Esther, who had the grace from God to be the defence and deliverance of her people by her intercession with Abasuerus. 'Through them,' she is told, 'God will bless even you in this world; all that you do for them he will account as done unto himself. Forget not then, my daughter, God has sent you into that country for them, for they are his people, who have suffered many years: welcome them with affection, listen to them with willingness, protect them with assiduity; it is your duty; they are worthy of regard not only on account of the afflictions they have endured, but still more for the sake of the religion in the cause of which they have suffered.'

"In treating of her duties to her husband, she is told that she ought to love his soul and seek his salvation, and daily to pray, and to cause special prayer to be made, that God would draw him to the true religion, in which, and even for which, his grandmother died. 'She has this wish for her grandchild in heaven, and it ought to be your ardent desire on earth: it is one of the designs which God has respecting you: he will make you the Bertha of our days: she, like you, a daughter of France, like you a Queen of England, obtained, by her holy life and her prayers, the gift of faith for her husband and for the city which you are about to enter.' This holy desire, it is suggested, ought to be a motive with her to put a force upon her own humour, and submit herself to the will and inclinations of the king in everything except religion, in which she is again exhorted to firmness and perseverance, on pain of her mother's malediction. In the conclusion of the letter, it is said to be one of the chief interests of France and England to be inseparably united, and that the queen should make herself the bond between them. She is then enjoined to use with great discretion 'the license which the English manner of living allows to ladies;' and sound rules are given for her deportment towards her household, and her own conduct and behaviour; but to these common-places of moral instruction, inserted by her crafty

counsellors merely as matters of custom and decorum, it was probably not expected that she should pay very serious attention. The real purport of the letter, to prompt her to make herself the head of a formidable faction within her husband's kingdom, was most consonant to the temper and inclinations of Henrietta, as well as to the secret views of the French cabinet ; and of this fatal suggestion she seems never to have lost sight."

The king met his bride at Dover on the 13th of June, and proceeded with her to Canterbury, whence on the following day they journeyed to Gravesend, where the royal barge was in attendance to convey them to Whitehall. Henrietta was at this time little more than fifteen years of age, and the smallness of her stature made her appear still younger. Her shape is said to have been somewhat awry, and her features were not regular; a pair of bright black eyes, and a sprightly and agreeable countenance, formed therefore her chief pretensions to beauty, as a lively style of talking was her principal claim to the reputation of talent. On her first introduction to Charles, she knelt down and kissed his hand, saying, as he raised and cordially embraced her, that she was come into his kingdom to be at his service and command. Afterwards, remarking that her youth and ignorance of the country might easily lead her into errors, which however she would be constantly willing to correct, she begged as a favour that he would engage always to let her hear of her faults from himself. He gave her a promise to this effect, and, as our author suggests, observed it with more exactness than she in truth desired; for beneath this air of diffidence and humility, which she had probably been instructed to assume in the commencement, Henrietta is accused of having concealed great haughtiness, an impetuous will, and a turn for intrigue, which it was the business of her French attendants to improve to the utmost. At the first public meal to which the royal pair sat down together, her majesty's confessor, taking his station beside her chair, warned her not to partake of the venison and pheasant carved to her by her husband, because "it was the eve of St. John Baptist, and was to be fasted; and" "that she should take heed how she gave ill example, or a scandal, at her first arrival." Nevertheless she ate heartily of both, to the great consolation of the Protestant by-standers, who, on this slight foundation, flattered themselves with the hope of her speedy conversion.

It had become customary among the popular leaders both in England and Scotland, to charge the sovereign with the intention of favouring popery, whenever any measure was adopted by the court which did not tally with the precise views of religious reformation recommended by the more rigid professors. The mar-

riage of the king with a zealous Romanist afforded a plausible pretext for reiterating such suspicions, and for enlisting against him the strongest prejudices of the multitude. The Puritans in both countries withdrew their allegiance from the government, because his majesty would not reduce the church to their model; and at length the spirit of enthusiasm diffused itself among all classes to such an extent as to disappoint all the ordinary views of human prudence, and to disturb the operation of every motive which usually influences mankind.

At an early epoch in the reign of James, the Scottish parliament passed an act by which all the church lands, not yet alienated from the clergy, were vested in the crown; a measure devised by the nobles, who at that time dominated in the councils of the young king, as an indirect but sure expedient for securing to themselves the larger share of those possessions. The eyes of the monarch were soon opened to the nefarious purposes meant to be served by the Statute of Annexation, which he denominated "a vile and pernicious act." In the *Basilikon Doron*, accordingly, he entreats his son, the prince, to annul it, should he ever possess sufficient power; having found that the ecclesiastical order was basely robbed, while the necessities of the royal household were not thereby relieved, though the latter object was one of the ostensible motives on which the whole scheme was founded.

When Charles went to visit his native dominions in the year 1633, he made an attempt to follow up his father's views, and to recover for the Church some part of the property of which it had been so dishonestly deprived. He set the example of restitution, by surrendering such lands as the crown still retained, and called upon the nobility to exercise a similar self-denial. But the zeal of his majesty excited anger rather than respect. The great barons, refusing to divest themselves of the domains which constituted no small portion of their wealth, secretly gave their countenance to the Puritanical party, who professed to dread the revival of Popish superstition much more than the load of hopeless poverty under which they laboured. Charles at first yielded every thing to his northern subjects, and was pleased to hear himself described as a contented king among a contented people, while he had in fact placed in the hands of weak friends or concealed enemies the means of aiming a fatal blow against the stability of his throne.

In a word, it was on the plea of religion that the civil war was begun. The Scottish covenanters, although their mouths were full of the most solemn professions of loyalty and pacific intentions, anticipated their southern neighbours, in making preparations for the struggle which they perceived to be inevitable. One of their first cares was to disperse by means of pedlars, who were

accustomed to traverse England in every direction, a Brief Declaration to clear themselves of *all slanders*, and especially of the imputed design of throwing off their allegiance and crossing the Tweed in arms. Orders were soon transmitted from the supreme committee of the insurgents at Edinburgh for a general training of the men of military age. Ammunition and accoutrements were secretly supplied by the Scottish merchants resident in Holland; while officers, who had served with reputation in the continental armies, hastened to bring the aid of their skill and valour. Alexander Lesley, one of the most distinguished of these leaders, had left Sweden, on the invitation of the Earl of Rothes, a covenanting lord, to take the chief command of the northern rebels. Loans were raised to a small extent, and family plate was contributed by the more ardent among the partisans; but their chief reliance was on the popular party in England, whose aid they employed both industry and address to secure.

Whitelock relates that their remonstrances, declarations, and pamphlets were dispersed, and their emissaries and agents insinuated into the company of all who were any way disappointed, discontented, or galled at the proceedings of the state. "The gentlemen who had been imprisoned for the loan or distrained for ship-money, or otherwise disobliged, had applications made to them from the covenanters, and secretly favoured and assisted their designs, and so did many others, especially those inclined to the Presbyterian government, or whom the public proceedings had any way distasted." It appears that their eyes were likewise turned to foreign countries. Baillie, one of the Scottish ministers and a member of the assembly of divines, communicates to a correspondent in the north the following intelligence: "We were hopeful of powerful assistance from abroad, if we would have required it. France would not have failed to embrace our protection. Holland and we were but one in our cause. They had been much irritated lately by the king's assistance of the Spaniard. Denmark was not satisfied with many of our prince's proceedings, and was much behind with the crown of Britain since his war with the emperor. Sweden was fully ours, to have granted us all the help they could spare from Germany."

But the Scots resolved to make no use of their foreign allies until their case should become desperate: they still hoped to gain Charles to the Presbyterian interest by fair means, which it is acknowledged would not have been so easily accomplished, had they induced the French, Dutch, or Swedes, to effect a landing in any part of the kingdom. Besides, these auxiliaries were either Lutherans or Papists; and to ask their assistance was described

by the preachers as being equivalent to "leaning on the broken reed of Egypt." They considered, moreover, their national poverty; the difficulty of raising pay for a large body of troops; and the intolerable insolence of such strangers when called upon to fight at their own expense. But the most powerful dissuasive against calling in the aid of foreigners, was founded on the consideration that any such a league must have made England their foe; the evil which of all others they most deprecated, and in which their adversaries were the most desirous to involve them.

It appears, however, that though such were the sentiments of the divines and of the more honest among the laity, the covenanting lords, with whom all along secular considerations had borne the principal sway, showed themselves less reserved. They did not indeed proceed so far as to invite foreign troops into their country, but they did not refuse to intrigue with Chambers, a Scottish priest, nephew to Cox, the papal nuncio, and almoner to Cardinal Richelieu, who was twice sent by that minister to inquire into the cause of the discontents which distracted his native country, and to encourage the disaffected. By means of this agent, whose conduct was so unworthy of his office, they entered into a secret treaty with the French government; in pursuance of which a large quantity of arms was procured from Holland, and a hundred thousand crowns placed at the disposal of General Lesley.

"It might," says Miss Aikin, "have appeared less inconsistent with the professions which the Covenanters had not yet desisted from making, to have suffered the first act of hostility to proceed from the king, and then to have given to their arms the plea of self-defence; but it was not the temper of the men to forego a solid and important advantage, for what they perhaps regarded as a vain punctilio, and no sooner was the royal army embodied at York than, by a simultaneous and preconcerted movement, the king's castles in Scotland were all assailed, and with the exception of Caerlavrock, every one, either by surprise or treachery, fell into their hands. In expectation of the attack of an English fleet under the command of the Marquis of Hamilton, the port of Leith was about the same time fortified by the hands of the whole population of the capital; noblemen and gentlemen labouring as volunteers upon the ramparts, and even ladies of the highest rank, in a wild transport of religious or patriotic enthusiasm, mingling with the throng, and lending their personal assistance in the conveyance of sand and rubbish."

The aid which the papal nuncio afforded to the Scottish covenanters supplies another instance of the hostility of the Romish Church to the Protestantism of England. The coalition is indeed singular, when the character and intentions of the two parties are considered; but it is not without example in the religious



history of this country. Jesuits are known to have imitated the usages of the Puritans, and even to have suggested innovations in the established worship, in order that they might thereby undermine or otherwise weaken the great bulwark of the Reformation. The same fact is of some value, as tending to throw light on the pretended loyalty of the Scotch during the early stages of the civil war. They were never wearied with making professions and protestations of regard for the king's person, of allegiance to his government, and of the most unlimited obedience to his just authority. But, meantime, they were making the circuit of Europe to find out allies whom they might bribe or seduce to take arms against him. French, Dutch, Swedes, and Danes were courted to join the confederacy which they meditated, and of which the object was to change by force the constitution of the country, compel their sovereign to adopt a religion which he disliked, and to subject the whole nation to the restraints of a vulgar fanaticism. Nay, they carried their loyalty to such an extent as to wage war against him in his own name, and to insist upon being paid from his exchequer for having violated his territory, defied him in the field, thwarted his plans, and compelled his friends to an ignominious retreat. Nor can these remarks be limited to the Scots who arranged themselves under the banner of the Covenant; for those about the person of the king indulged, it has been alleged, in similar freedom of conscience. Charles exacted an obligation from his followers that they would oppose, to the utmost hazard of life and fortune, all seditions, rebellions, and conspiracies, especially such as should come veiled under pretence of religion. "The Scots," says Clarendon, "took it to a man, without grieving their conscience or mending their manners." But it must not be concealed, that fickleness or want of sincerity appeared among many others besides the natives of North Britain. Lords Say and Brook were the only individuals who declined to take the oath dictated by the king; and yet every one knows how inefficient it proved to secure the loyalty of Essex, Arundel, Holland, and many other peers, who had pledged life, fortune, and honour in the royal cause.

The English people, however, generally speaking, were not the aggressors in the melancholy war which threw so many families into mourning. It was unquestionably in the reign of James, and even in the writings of that monarch himself, that the first precise claim of absolute power was made in behalf of the crown, and a solemn, elaborate exposition attempted of the duty of passive obedience on the part of the subject. That these doctrines should have called forth contradictions and denials, and led to the angry assertion of opposite opinions, was clearly unavoid-



able; and if extravagant notions were alternately maintained on both sides, in the course of a controversy which could not be altogether dispassionate, the blame should undoubtedly rest with those who gave the challenge, and courted that appeal to first principles which is exceedingly hazardous in all political theories. To a certain extent, indeed, such discussions were become inevitable. Not only had the age avowed itself more speculative and intelligent than formerly, but the wealth and numbers of the middle class had much increased, while the decay of the great nobility and the dilapidation of the royal demesnes, had deranged the old balance of the constitution. A crisis had, accordingly, arrived, the claims of which could not possibly be determined without a thorough examination of those reasons upon which the pretensions of the conflicting parties were rested.

But, though the final struggle itself was, perhaps, unavoidable, there are circumstances connected with it which reflect no honour on the councillors by whom Charles was guided in his preliminary measures. The cruel imprisonments, the finings, the pillory, the abominable brandings, the cutting of ears, and slitting of noses, which were inflicted on the authors of popular pamphlets and seditious harangues, could not be justified either by law or good policy. For this bad example the government was responsible; and it has been observed, that it was not followed to any great extent by the parliamentary party when in possession of power and exasperated to the highest degree.

The dissolution of the first Parliament was the true beginning of the contest between the king and the representatives of the people; the latter refusing to grant supplies until they had obtained a redress of grievances. War, indeed, may be said to have been proclaimed when he announced to the next House of Commons, that if they were not more liberal than their predecessors, he would have recourse to other councils, raise a revenue by his own authority, and govern for the future without their assistance. These threats were unhappily carried into execution: members were put under arrest for their speeches in Parliament; money was extorted by forced loans, monopolies, and ship-money; and, finally, commissions were issued to fine and imprison all who should resist these violent exactions.

One of the most remarkable passages in the history of Charles, as Mr. Fellowes has observed, is his attempt to seize the five arraigned members by his personal appearance in the House of Commons, which was followed up by his unsuccessful search for them in the city, and his sudden retreat to Hampton Court and thence to York. According to contemporary documents on the subject, it appears that the king had, recently before, not only got

together an irregular guard consisting of discharged officers and others, but had prevailed on a number of the students in the inns of court to enrol themselves as an additional protection—that the day previous to his visit to the House he had ordered them to be in attendance at an hour's warning—that on the very morning a hundred stand of arms, with gunpowder and ammunition, had been brought from the Tower to Whitehall—and that Charles proceeded to the Commons with a tumultuous escort of about five hundred men, many of them having pistols and other firearms, who would not allow the doors to be shut after his entry, and used much threatening and insolent language during the whole extraordinary scene. It is also stated by Clarendon that, after the proscribed members took refuge in the city, it was proposed by Lord Digby to go after them with a select company of gentlemen, whereof Lunsford was one, and to seize and bring them away, dead or alive.

However, then, we may condemn many of the measures pursued by the Parliament before and during this calamitous war; however much we may lament the murder of the monarch, and feel inclined to venerate the sovereign authority thus trampled upon and set at nought; we cannot help, at the same time, deploring those arbitrary measures which gave an origin to these evils and led to such a miserable catastrophe. Nor can we, in common justice, avoid making due allowance for men, who, being endowed with that quick apprehension of their rights inherent in Englishmen, attached to their national privileges, and resentful of injury, were prepared to encounter every peril, and yield to every sacrifice, for the preservation of their liberties.\*

But, as we have already remarked, the current of feeling in the present age runs only in one direction. The violences committed by the royalist party are exaggerated and condemned in the most furious manner, while the seditious arts and unwarrantable pretensions, which disgraced the other side, are either studiously palliated or boldly vindicated as the legitimate resources of self-defence. Nothing, for example, can be more manifest to the dispassionate reader than that the chiefs of the popular faction used all means to excite the rage and suspicion of the multitude against the king; and that whenever the public mind appeared to subside towards repose, they had instant recourse to the propagation of groundless rumours and fictitious alarms. 'Thus when on one occasion, the Parliament adjourned, a committee of both Houses continued to sit, armed with extraordinary powers, and, it is added, many designs were in agitation. "I hear," writes the

\* Historical Sketches, pp. v. vi. vii.

“ Secretary Nicholas to his master, “ there are diverse meetings  
 “ at Chelsea, at the Lord Mandeville’s house, and elsewhere, by  
 “ Pym and others, to consult what is best to be done at their next  
 “ meeting in Parliament; and I believe they will, in the first  
 “ place, fall on some plausible thing that may ingratiate them in  
 “ the people’s good opinion, which is their anchor-hold and only  
 “ interest; and if I am not much misinformed, that will be either  
 “ upon Papists or upon some act for expunging officers and  
 “ councillors here, according to the Scottish precedent; or on  
 “ both together.” The London apprentices were still more  
 ready to hear the voice of Pym announcing the horrors of popery,  
 than the discharged officers were to obey the summons of Lord  
 Digby, inviting them to protect the person of the sovereign. No  
 more than a gentle hint from the proper quarter was necessary to  
 marshal the mob for an attack on Lambeth palace, having for  
 its object robbery, devastation, and perhaps murder; and when  
 punishment was inflicted, according to the fashion of the times, a  
 demand was made for a tribute of sympathy and regret from all  
 the lovers of freedom.

Charles has been called the *martyr* of religion, while he was, in  
 fact, its *victim*. Accused of viewing with a favourable eye the  
 Roman ritual, merely because he allowed his wife to adhere to  
 the faith in which she was educated, he was, at the very same  
 moment, denounced by the Catholic powers as an enemy to their  
 communion. Those of his subjects who professed the ancient  
 form, grateful for the mildness of his administration, were not  
 unwilling to aid him in his struggle with the Parliament; being  
 aware that the latter would not rest satisfied with any law which  
 permitted even the most private exercise of their worship. But  
 the Pope interposed his authority to check the overflowing of this  
 kind disposition towards an heretical prince. Addressing his  
 nuncio, he says, “ You are to command the Catholics of England  
 “ in general that they suddenly desist from making such offers of  
 “ men towards this northern expedition as we hear they have  
 “ done, little to the advantage of their discretion: and likewise it  
 “ is requisite, considering the penalty already imposed, that they  
 “ be not too forward with money, more than what law and duty  
 “ enjoin them to pay. Declare unto the best of the peers and  
 “ gentlemen, by word of mouth or letter, that they ought not to  
 “ express any averseness in case the high court of Parliament  
 “ be called, nor show any discontent at the acts which do not  
 “ aim point-blank at religion. Advise the clergy to desist from  
 “ that foolish, nay, rather illiterate and childish custom of distin-  
 “ guishing between the Protestant and Puritan doctrine. And  
 “ especially this error is so much the greater when they attempt

“ to prove that Protestantism is a degree nearer the Catholic faith  
“ than the other; for since both of them are without the verge of  
“ the church, it is needless hypocrisy to speak of it; yea, it begets  
“ more malice than its worth.”

It may be noticed, that some Roman Catholics, a short time before, had assembled at London under the auspices of the nuncio, for the purpose of recommending a loyal contribution to be made by all persons of their religion throughout the kingdom, whether priests or laymen. By that expedient a small pecuniary aid was obtained for the king; but it was at the expense of much popular odium against the court, and more especially against the queen and her religion.

On the other hand, Charles suffered not a little from the hostility of that class of professors who, while they set an undue value on certain doctrines, evolved during the heat of the Reformation, overlooked or denied the importance of the sacerdotal character, as connected with apostolical institution. In the commencement of that great ecclesiastical revolution which shook or menaced all the thrones of Europe, there prevailed everywhere very lax notions in regard as well to the foundation whereon the Christian Church is really supported, as to the source whence her ministers derived their authority in sacred things. Having been accustomed to esteem the Pope as the fountain of all power, whether in relation to their sacraments or discipline, the clergy were at a loss where to look for a substitute to his Holiness; not recollecting, in the first moments of ardent discussion, that, in every bishop, duly consecrated, there were lodged the same official attributes which they were wont to venerate in the Roman pontiff. Hence, most of the reformed churches were originally Erastian; reposing in the civil ruler that undefined supremacy which they only agreed in ravishing from the successors of St. Peter. It was not till a later period, when reflection came to the aid of zeal, that the Protestant divines learned to distinguish, in their predecessors of the Roman communion, the valid priesthood from the erroneous doctrine and superstitious usage. Laud, who enjoyed the confidence of the king, had formed correct views of ecclesiastical polity; a praise to which he has a just claim, whatever may be thought of his practical wisdom in enforcing its principles at the troubled period during which he occupied the primacy. His opinions on this subject became extremely unpopular, being connected, it was thought, not only with the divine right of his own order, but also with that of the temporal sovereign whose cause in the general mind was already associated with the interests of episcopacy.

Abbot could not be induced to co-operate with his more fervid

brother. He was one of those who wished to disclaim all alliance and affinity with the Roman Catholics, and to derive the visible Church through the Berengarians and Albigenses to the Wicliffites and Hussites, and thence to the later reformers. Laud, on the contrary, traced it from the Apostles through the Church of Rome and other communions in the East and South; maintaining that without bishops there could not be any true church. These opinions, boldly stated in a sermon preached before the University of Oxford, many years prior to the king's quarrel with the Parliament, had drawn upon him a public censure, which Abbot, then vice-chancellor, was believed to have prompted; and this had proved the foundation of a lasting enmity between the two prelates.

“Nor, in fact, was the dispute a trifling one, or void of practical application: on the question of apostolical succession, almost the whole controversy between the Presbyterian and Prelatical, the Calvinistic and Arminian parties, might be made to hinge; and the different modes of deciding it manifestly led to directly opposite systems of ecclesiastical polity, both foreign and domestic. If the Church of Rome were totally erroneous and antichristian, every approach towards it, all conformity and community with it, even in externals and things in their own nature indifferent, was to be regarded as odious and sinful; and it became a duty to bear an unceasing testimony against it, to wage with it a war of extermination. Thus the scruples of the Puritans respecting ceremonies and vestments, the cross and the surplice, would become consistent and respectable, and even their intolerance might appear justified; and though the Anglican Church should see fit, as matter of expediency, to retain her own episcopacy, it would become her to stretch out the right hand of fellowship to all the reformed churches without distinction, and to aid them by every possible exertion in making head against the common enemy, the great popish confederacy of Europe. On the other hand, if the Church of Rome, although erroneous and corrupt in certain points, were still to be regarded as a true and mother church, it would follow that in all matters, either indifferent or undetermined, her example was to be respectfully consulted, nor was even her authority without special cause to be rejected. The decisions of her canonists and the decrees of her councils must still be held in force; even her traditions were entitled to regard; and as the question was no longer between the kingdom of Christ and that of Antichrist, but between a venerable though erring parent, and a daughter still affectionate though no longer implicitly obedient, schemes of mutual conciliation might be innocently, nay, meritoriously, attempted, and might even yet succeed in producing an entire re-union, and closing up for ever the long and lamentable schism of the British isles.”

It is not, therefore, surprising, that with so avowed a deference for the Romish Church, Laud should in those days have passed both with Catholics and Puritans for a concealed Papist; yet it is

certain, that he not only differed from that Church, in some points both of doctrine and discipline, but that he wrote one of the ablest refutations of her errors which has ever yet proceeded from the pen of a Protestant divine. The Reply to the Jesuit Fisher is still esteemed a very satisfactory exposition of the reformed tenets, and a powerful defence of the grounds on which they are maintained. But, nevertheless, the Archbishop of Canterbury was denounced as a Romanist, and Charles, who approved his principles and commended his zeal, was implicated in the charge of disaffection to the pure truths of the Gospel. The alliance between a church tending, as it was ignorantly imagined, to popery, and a king tending, as it was suspected, to arbitrary power, cast upon both a double weight of odium. In a word, the sovereign and the ecclesiastical estate were accused of conspiring against the liberty of the people; and it is asserted, that the former laboured with extreme assiduity to secure the hierarchy as his ally in his attempt to render himself independent of Parliament.

At all events it will be found that the demagogues in the lower House had the ingenuity to connect the royal cause with the unpopular notions of Popery and Arminianism. For instance, when Charles urged the Commons to pass a bill for granting tonnage and poundage, they instructed their committee to give the preference to an inquiry into the state of religion. Mr. Pym accordingly proceeded to offer to the consideration of the House, first, the impunity and encouragement shown to Papists, and the violation of law by the introduction of superstitious ceremonies into the Church; and, secondly, the doctrines taught by the Arminians, as inconsistent with the Articles sanctioned at Dort. He undertook to show wherein these late opinions were contrary to those settled truths, and what men have since been preferred who have professed such heresies. He drew their attention also to the pardons recently granted to some accused of writing false doctrines, and to the presumption of others who had dared to preach "the contrary to truth" before his majesty. He reminded them that it was the duty of Parliament to establish true religion, and to punish false—that parliaments have confirmed general councils—and that as for the Convocation, it was but the provincial synod of Canterbury, and could not bind the whole kingdom.

After this another member pronounced a tirade against a royal declaration, of which Laud was supposed to be the author, which asserted the right of the bishops and clergy regularly convoked, to decree all matters of outward regulation in the Church, and determine concerning the interpretation of the Articles. The House, to testify its hostility to the new doctrine, as it was called, now



entered into a solemn vow, declaring its "adherence to the sense of the articles of religion settled in the thirteenth year of Elizabeth, delivered to them by the public act of the Church of England, and by the general and concurrent expositions of the writers of the Church." They embraced the same opportunity of expressing their abhorrence of the meaning assigned to that standard of their faith by Jesuits, Arminians, and all others who questioned the Calvinistic exposition. They concluded by resolving to petition the king to appoint a day of fasting on account of the distressed state of the Protestant churches abroad; thereby at once insinuating their displeasure at his supposed apathy in the cause of evangelical truth, and conveying to the people an indirect assurance that the Parliament alone took an interest in the success of pure religion among foreigners as well as at home.

It is remarkable that Charles was censured by the popular party in England, for pursuing, in regard to the Church, the very line of policy which was dictated to him by the Scottish covenanters. The latter claimed the right of regulating all matters of doctrine, discipline, and worship in their periodical assemblies, whether general or provincial, without any dependence upon the civil power, or indeed any other reference to it than such as was implied in a legal sanction of their proceedings. The interference of the state in their ecclesiastical arrangements was one of the evils against which the Presbyters of the north lifted up their voices with the greatest vehemence; and yet we find that the relinquishment of this offensive portion of the prerogative was condemned by the puritanical parliament as a violation of law! Pym asserted that it was the duty of the legislature to establish true religion, and to punish false—the very position, it is true, with which the Scottish reformers commenced their attack on the papal hierarchy, but which they soon discovered to be the most fruitful source of animosity and vexation. When they conferred the power now mentioned on the executive government, the phrase "true religion" had but one acceptation in their minds; being restricted to the particular form of words and discipline which pleased them at a certain stage of their innovations. Afterwards, when the king and council showed some disposition to assist with their advice in determining the ultimate model of the ecclesiastical constitution, they not only retracted their original concession, and demanded for their body an entire relief from the restraints of civil jurisdiction, but even claimed, in all spiritual concerns, an undisputed superiority both to Crown and Parliament.

So malignant, indeed, was the fortune of Charles, that it had become utterly impossible for him to give satisfaction to more than a part of his subjects. His duty to one class was regarded



by another as an attack on their privileges. Wisdom in one portion of his dominions was denounced as folly in a contiguous province; and even at the last, when he was solicited by the House and the Army respectively to listen to terms of accommodation, he had only the choice of placing himself at the head of the Parliament against the military faction, or to put his trust in those ambitious soldiers who had resolved to overthrow the tyranny of bigots and lawyers. He saw clearly that he could not gain both, and to take side with either would only have had the effect of perpetuating the civil war, under a change of colours, at the expense of a great sacrifice of principle and honour. So it was with respect to religion in those evil days. Persecution of Roman Catholics was popular in England, and rendered in some degree obligatory on the king: in Ireland, where a great majority adhered to the ancient faith, the execution of penal laws would have manifested an equal want of humanity and of understanding. The Churchmen here, the Presbyterians in Scotland, the Independents in the army, and the Puritans everywhere, were urgent for the adoption of their respective systems; while, in fact, they agreed in nothing but in their abuse or suspicion of one another.

No one who has read the history of England during the seventeenth century can fail to recollect many instances of the illiberal spirit which prevailed among Christians of all denominations. The Irish, who were generally loyal, and sought little more than the free exercise of their religion, had solicited from the king certain concessions, denominated *graces*, as the price of those supplies in men and money, which they were aware had become indispensable to their sovereign. By the conditions required, that unhappy people were to be relieved from various oppressions, civil, judicial, and commercial. The object of one stipulation was to restrict to a period of sixty years past, all inquiries on the part of the crown into defective titles to land; by another, Catholic landowners were to be admitted to sue out their liveries, without taking the oath of abjuration; and by a third, the rites of the Roman worship were to be admitted to a free toleration. The last article instantly roused the fears and the zeal of the Protestant hierarchy; and twelve Irish bishops, with Usher, their learned primate, at their head, signed a protestation, that the religion of the Papists being "superstitious and idolatrous, their faith and doctrine erroneous and heretical, their church in respect of both apostatical," to grant them toleration was a grievous sin, and to do so for money was to set religion to sale.

On this occasion, as on too many others of a similar nature, Charles was beset with difficulties which he could not overcome without having recourse to that ambiguous policy which has left

on his name the stain of double-dealing. He was obliged to substitute for the toleration promised to the Catholics a bare connivance at their worship; and, being uncertain whether he could carry his measures through the Parliament, which he had engaged to summon, he availed himself of an irregularity in the writ issued by the lord-deputy, and permitted the season to pass by.

But neither moderation nor prudence could save him from the imputations of the Commons, who had determined to bring his motives into bad odour with the people at large. No sooner did the House assemble, after a temporary adjournment, than Sir John Eliot pronounced a speech containing the following passages :

“ The misfortunes we suffer are many : Arminianism undermines us ; Popery comes in upon us. They mask not in strange disguises, but expose themselves to the view of the world. In the search of these we have fixed our eyes, not on the actors, the jesuits and priests, but upon their masters—those who are in authority. You have some prelates who are their abettors : the great Bishop of Winchester—we know what he hath done to favour them. This fear extends to some others : the lord treasurer, in whose person all evil is contracted, both for the innovation of our religion and the invasion of our liberties—he is a great enemy of the commonwealth ; I have traced him in all his actions : and from this fear they go about to break parliaments—lest parliaments should break them. I find him the head of all that party—the Papists ; and all the jesuits and priests derive from him their shelter and protection.”

Nor was the king the only member of the royal family whose character was aspersed on account of religion. Henrietta, too, was an object of unmitigated rancour to the Puritans, whose hostility against her increased in proportion to the influence which she was supposed to possess in the councils of her husband. For example, Bernard, a lecturer in London, publicly prayed to the Lord to “ open the queen’s majesty’s eyes that she may see Jesus Christ, whom she has pierced with her infidelity, superstition, and idolatry.” This slanderer was pardoned on making a suitable submission. Leighton, however, refused to express any such acknowledgment, although he had in his “ *Zion’s Plea against Prelacy*,” stigmatized her as an *idolatress*, a *Canaanitess*, and a *daughter of Heth*. The severe punishment inflicted on the seditious railing of this author created at once a strong sympathy in his favour, and a violent reaction against the government. Prynne, in his turn, renewed the attack on the same illustrious female; applying the most offensive terms to certain innocent amusements introduced at court, and reflecting on her character in language which would not be tolerated in the humblest society. In this case, too, as no redress could be found at common law, a state prosecution exposed the crown to further obloquy, and added one more to the number of popular martyrs.

It is deserving of remark, that the persecution directed against Henrietta ceased not with her own times. Miss Aikin, influenced by that singular spirit which makes women judge unfavourably of one another in all cases of imputed libertinism, has given a place in her pages to a silly and most improbable story lately published on the authority of a former Lord Dartmouth. "Before the civil war," his lordship is made to say, "the queen had a very particular aversion to Duke Hamilton, which he perceiving, prevailed with Mrs. Seymour, who attended upon her in her bed-chamber, to let him into the queen's private apartment at Somerset House, when he surprised the queen in great familiarities with Henry Jermyn, after which she durst never refuse the duke any thing he desired of her." The authority for this anecdote is as follows: Lord Dartmouth had it from Sir Francis Compton, who had it from his mother, who had it from Mrs. Seymour, who was drowned "in shooting London Bridge." The reader will naturally ask what credit was due to Mrs. Seymour, who, according to this precious morsel of court scandal, connived at the unlawful visit of Henry Jermyn, and then let in the Duke of Hamilton to witness the frailty or folly of her royal mistress! If testimony be admitted to derive any weight from the character of the witness, this little narrative will be found very deficient in its claims to our belief; for, assuredly, few females could be selected, even from the neighbourhood of Wapping, whose evidence would be found to labour under greater or juster suspicion. Our lady author, notwithstanding these grounds of mistrust, pronounces Henrietta guilty, and describes Harry Jermyn as the queen's "favoured lover!"

The king is further blamed for issuing the Royal Instructions, though the object was unquestionably to enforce discipline and promote the true interests of religion. The prelates were enjoined constant residence and unremitting vigilance; catechising was substituted for afternoon sermons; lecturers were subjected to such regulations as might prevent them from thwarting the stated incumbents; the governors of the Church being required to use all means in order to learn what was said by preachers and lecturers in their discourses, that they might adopt measures for correcting abuses, whether in doctrine or worship. The practice of engaging, as private chaplains, clergymen holding parochial cures, had become general, and was attended with many disadvantages. It was therefore ruled, that none under the rank of noblemen, except such other persons as were qualified by law, should entertain domestic chaplains in their houses, and thereby prevent them from performing divine service in church. No man was debarred from having within his walls

an individual in holy orders to direct his devotions: the restriction applied solely to the privilege, perhaps not very wisely extended even to the highest ranks, of retaining domestic ministers, who might, at the same time, derive emolument from charges which they did not actually fill. Such a manifestation of zeal for order and efficiency, however, instead of receiving the applause which it deserves, is seized by Miss Aikin, as a fit opportunity for declaiming against the future primate, and lamenting the impediment thrown in the way of "domestic worship," by one of the first clergymen in the land.

There is also an observation relative to Laud which we know not whether to ascribe to ignorance or malice. In a discussion at Oxford on certain doctrinal points, this churchman is said to have dropped, in the presence of the king, some expressions in disparagement of the married clergy; suggesting that, in the disposal of benefices, other things being equal, his majesty ought to give the preference to such as lived in celibacy. As applicable to the habits and discipline of a University, there can be no doubt that the principle of selection recommended by the bishop was worthy of consideration. But it is, at once, denounced as a daring approach to Rome! Then, with equal wisdom and candour, it is subjoined, that he saw the expediency of a retraction, which he made indirectly, by negotiating a marriage between one of his own chaplains and a daughter of Windebank, clerk of the signet. He himself likewise performed for them in the chapel of London House, the nuptial ceremony, with all other ecclesiastical rites which belonged to the solemnization of matrimony by the rules of the English Church. These rites, every one knows, implied the administration of the holy communion, which, as is mentioned in a rubric annexed to the office at the present day, "it is convenient that the new married persons should receive at the time of their marriage, or at the first opportunity after their marriage." But Miss Aikin, being still in happy ignorance of all such usages, makes no scruple to condemn the whole as "flat popery." Ecclesiastical rites, belonging to the celebration of matrimony! Remarkable expressions! she exclaims, "which seem to imply "an administration of the sacrament, preceded, *possibly*, as "among the Catholics, by auricular confession, known to be one "of the practices of what he regarded as the primitive Church, "which this prelate laboured to restore."

We have already alluded to the failure of the king's views in regard to the Scottish Church. He found Episcopacy the established form of religion; and he was very naturally desirous to support an institution which he believed not only to be divine, but also much better fitted to coalesce with a monarchical govern-

ment, than the democracy that lurked under the disguise of Presbyterianism. A feeling of national pride, rather than any peculiar notions as to doctrine, induced the prelates of the north to recommend the compilation of a Book of Common Prayer, which might bear the name of their country, and to resume the communion service that had been used in the days of Edward the Sixth. It seems, however, that the authors of this undertaking did not take sufficient pains to carry with them the concurrence of the great body of the clergy, nor to prepare the people for its reception; for, upon due investigation, it will appear that the hostility shown to the celebrated Liturgy, tendered by Charles the First to his Scottish subjects, arose not so much from their aversion to preconceived forms of prayer, as from the supposed influence of Laud and other Arminian divines in the cabinet of their sovereign.

As a proof of what has now been stated, we may remind the reader that a printed form of public prayer was used in the Cathedral Church of Edinburgh, down to the period at which the new Liturgy was introduced. The very morning of the day on which Jenny Geddes immortalized her name, as the leader of the heroines who defeated the project of the English primate and blasted the hopes of the king, prayers were *read* by the reverend Patrick Henderson. At the end of the service he addressed his audience in these words: "Adieu, good people, for this I think is the last time of my reading prayers in this place," which caused a great murmuring in the congregation. In truth, no small exertions had been made to excite the enmity of the multitude against the new Book and the canons. The rabble, too, there is every reason to believe, acted under the direction of cooler heads than their own, and accomplished by their violence an object which gratified the revenge or the cupidity of a large class of men, who found it not convenient to appear in opposition to their sovereign. It is customary among certain writers to account for the aversion of the Scots to their national liturgy, by alleging that they perceived a strong popish tendency in some parts of the ritual; but this apology will not be urged by any one who is capable of comparing that celebrated compilation with the Common Prayer of our own Church, from which it deviates only in a few verbal alterations. Laud was perfectly justified in asserting that the variations introduced were of little or no consequence; forming a distinction rather than a difference between the devotional systems of the two kingdoms.

The landowners of Scotland, ever since the spoliations of Knox, and the appropriation to lay hands of church demesnes and tithes, in the non-age of the first James, have steadily opposed

every advance towards the permanent re-establishment of episcopacy. The rejection of the Prayer Book and the Canons might possibly have been traced to the apprehension of losing acres of rich fields, and annual bushels of corn, formerly ravaged from the ecclesiastical estate. Charles sacrificed his popularity in the north as soon as he proposed restitution to the clergy. Nay, he was further induced to consent to an arrangement which has condemned the national church in that part of the kingdom to hopeless poverty. A commutation of tithes was effected on a principle which, while it contemplates the improvement of every other class in society, prevents all increase in the income of the ministers; except in so far as it may be effected by a temporary rise in the market price of corn. The *quantity* of grain in most parishes is fixed for ever.

By the regulation now alluded to, the owner of an estate had the right to demand that an estimate should be taken of the amount of its produce, calculated in quarters of corn; and the tenth part of this estimate, to be paid in kind or compounded for in money, was thenceforth to be chargeable on the property, as the maintenance due to the Church. The lands, thus valued, were to be for ever exempted from all other demands in name of tithe.

As agriculture in Scotland was then at the lowest ebb, the estimate of the yearly produce, even of the best land under cultivation, must have been calculated on a very depressed scale. The improved system of management since introduced has augmented the annual returns of the farmer tenfold at least; but the clergyman continues to be paid according to the tithe as it was estimated two hundred years ago, in an age at once rude, extremely unsettled, and ignorant of nearly all the arts which render human labour productive. Besides, immense tracts, which are now covered with luxuriant crops, being then in a state of nature, were not taken into the account at all; and accordingly, in many districts, more than half of the soil is tithe-free. Nor is the minister entitled to the full amount of the tithe, even on the low estimate at which it was taken. The portion which alone he can claim is measured out to him by a committee of the judges in the court of session, who, in this case, are empowered by law to determine the extent of every living where the tithes or *tiends*, as they are called, are not already appropriated. In this way Charles granted a boon to the owners of estates, the value of which, however, was soon forgotten during the tumult and disaffection of civil war.

We cannot follow the course of hostilities nor of Miss Aikin, during the latter years of the unfortunate king. Suffice it to observe, that the issue of battle and the opinions of this authoress are



generally against him. On all questions that admit of doubt, she leans to the unfavourable side—often, indeed, with the air of one who has formed a determination, and then sets out in quest of reasons to support it. His conduct in regard to the Petition of Right, the affair of Glamorgan, and the commission of O'Neale, is condemned in the gross, and evidently without a minute knowledge of the circumstances on which a correct historical judgment ought to rest. But she has no hard words for the faction who afterwards brought him to the scaffold. Bradshaw “is an able and accomplished lawyer, of courageous character and firm deportment;” and in the appointment of the court who were to try the king she maintains that care was taken by the council of officers who had seized the helm of the state, “to render it as much as possible a representation of the different ranks and classes of society concerned in the decision.” As a proof of this impartiality, she mentions the leading members of parliament of the independent party, the Lord-General Fairfax, Lieutenant-General Cromwell, Major-General Skippon, Commissary-General Ireton, and all the colonels of the army—the very persons who had resolved to sacrifice him at the shrine of their ambition.

Most constitutional writers have condemned the murder of Charles, as being at once unnecessary and impolitic. His errors were forgotten in sympathy for his hard fate; and a path was thereby opened up for the restoration of the monarchy, in the person of his son, without, in the meanwhile, securing the authority of law, or providing suitable restraints on the royal prerogative. The vindictive close of this first revolution rendered another inevitable. Miss Aikin, however, sees no reason for questioning the expediency of bringing the sovereign to the block. “To pronounce any solid judgment, whether moral or political, respecting the sentence executed upon him, would require a discussion of the alternatives which offered themselves to the choice of the party leaders of the time, of the aspects of affairs in their eyes, of their motives and ulterior designs, foreign from the character of this work, and to which the writer feels herself in many ways unequal.”

But this modest feeling never incapacitates the learned authoress, except when she might be expected to cast her eyes on both sides, and regard matters with a little impartiality. In the royal interests, there were “aspects of affairs” which required consideration, and also “alternatives which offered themselves to the choice of the leaders;” and hence a similar difficulty in pronouncing a judgment, whether moral or political, on their proceedings. Here, however, she experiences no hesitation; condemning with



that facility which those persons exclusively enjoy who, in conducting an argument, listen only to one set of reasons.

In respect, again, to the authenticity of the *Icon Basilike*, a point which has employed the research and exercised the talents of more than one ingenious person, "she has no hesitation in stating her entire conviction that Dr. Gauden was, as he affirmed himself to be, the real author of that book." We also have examined into the facts and probabilities of this case not less attentively than Miss Aikin, and the result is far from being an "entire conviction" either way. That the book contains allusions to plans and occurrences of which Dr. Gauden could know nothing, and which allusions were not fully understood until some years after the "*Icon*" was printed, is not denied by any one; whence arises a strong presumption that the learned divine could not be sole author of the said miscellany. Gauden was not in the confidence of Charles—never, indeed, was in his presence, except on the very ordinary occasion of preaching a sermon at the chapel-royal, and could not therefore become acquainted with his solitary thoughts. But sufficient evidence has been produced to prove that amid the casualties which befel the manuscript in the various attempts to have it secretly put to press, it passed for a time into the hands of the doctor. Besides, there is but too little reason to doubt that Gauden was not incapable of claiming, for the labours of a corrector, the reward, which he thought due to the writer of a production so seasonable, and which was known to be attended with effects very favourable to the interests of royalty.

The reader will not be displeased to peruse the following extract, supplementary to the narrative given by Phelps, as abridged in the *Historical Sketches*. The parliament had issued orders that Nye, Marshall, Caryl, Salway, and Dell should attend the king, after sentence was passed, to administer to him such spiritual helps as might be deemed suitable to his condition. But his majesty, well knowing what comforters they were likely to prove, resolved to have no conference with them.

The morning of the 30th of January, before the king was brought from St. James's.

The Bishop of London (who with much ado was permitted to wait upon him a day before, and to assist him in that sad instant) read divine service in his presence, in which the 27th of St. Matthew—the history of our Saviour's crucifixion—proved the second lesson. The king, supposing it to have been selected on purpose, thanked him afterwards for his seasonable choice; but the bishop, modestly declining that undue thanks, told him that it was the lesson appointed for that day. He also then and there received of the bishop the holy sacrament, and performed all his devotions in preparation to his passion. Which ended, about ten of the clock his majesty was brought from St. James's to Whitehall by a

regiment of foot, with colours flying and drums beating, part marching before and part behind, with a private guard of partisans about him, the bishop on the one hand, and Colonel Tomlinson, who had the charge of him, on the other; his majesty, walking very fast, and bidding them to go faster, added that he now went before them to strive for a heavenly crown, with less solicitude than he had often encouraged his soldiers to fight for an earthly diadem.

“ Being come to the end of the park, he went up the stairs leading to the long gallery in Whitehall, and so into the cabinet chamber, where he used formerly to lodge. There finding an unexpected delay in being brought upon the scaffold, which they had not yet fitted, he passed the time, at convenient distances, in prayer. About twelve of the clock, his majesty refusing to dine, only ate a bit of bread and drank a glass of claret; and about an hour after, Colonel Hacker, with other officers and soldiers, brought him, with the bishop and Colonel Tomlinson, through the banqueting house to the scaffold, to which the passage was made through a window. Diverse companies of foot and troops of horse were placed on each side of the street, which hindered the approach of the very numerous spectators, and the king from speaking what he had premeditated and prepared for them to hear. Whereupon his majesty, finding himself disappointed, omitted much of his intended matter; and, for what he meant to speak, directed himself chiefly to Colonel Tomlinson.”

He maintained that he did not begin the war upon the two Houses of Parliament, but that they began it upon him; and, for proof of this, he referred to the date of the commissions issued by the popular party, and likewise to their declarations, which, he insisted, left no doubt that they gave a commencement to the unhappy troubles. Far from representing himself as altogether free from guilt, he acknowledged that he deserved the afflictions sent upon him by Divine Providence, “ which many times does pay justice by an unjust sentence.” And, he adds, “ I will only say that an unjust sentence, that I suffered to take effect, is punished now by an unjust sentence upon me.” The allusion here was to the Earl of Strafford.

Bishop Juxon reminded him that, though his majesty's attachment to the Protestant religion was well known, yet it might be expected he should say something for the satisfaction of the world. The king replied I thank you heartily for that, my lord; I had almost forgotten it. He then added; “ in truth, sirs, my conscience in religion I think is very well known to all the world; and therefore I declare before you all that I die a Christian, according to the profession of the Church of England, as I found it left by my father: and this honest man, pointing to the bishop, I think, will witness it.”

He told the executioner that he should say but very short prayers; and subjoined, “ when I hold out my hands.” After adjusting his hair, and putting it under a cap, he took off his

cloak, and the insignia of the order of St. George, he delivered the latter to the bishop, saying *Remember!* Then putting off his doublet, and being in his waistcoat, he put on his cloak again, and, looking upon the block, said to the executioner, "You must set it fast."

"*Executioner.* — 'It is fast, sir.'

"*King.* — 'It might have been a little higher.'

"*Executioner.* — 'It can be no higher, sir.'

"*King.* — 'When I put my hands this way, then.' " —

Then having said a few words to himself, as he stood with hands and eyes lifted up, immediately stooping down, he laid his head on the block, and the executioner again putting his hair under his cap, his majesty, thinking that he was going to strike, bade him "Stay for the sign." The other replied, "Yes, I will and it please your majesty." After a very short pause, the king stretching forth his hands, the executioner severed his head from his body.

His blood was taken up by diverse persons for different ends; by some as trophies of their villainy, by others as relics of a martyr. Being embalmed and laid in a coffin of lead, to be seen for some days by the people, it was at length, on Wednesday the 7th February, delivered to four of his servants, Herbert, Mildmay, Preston, and Joyner, who, with some others, attended the hearse that night to Windsor, and placed it in the room that was formerly the king's bed chamber. Next day it was removed into the dean's hall, which was hung with black and made dark, and lights were set burning round the hearse. About three in the afternoon, the Duke of Richmond, the Marquis of Hartford, the Earls of Southampton and Lindsey, and the Bishop of London, arrived to superintend the burial of the king. The governor, Colonel Whichcot, refused to allow the funeral service to be read, or the body to be deposited in St. George's Chapel. The lords, by means of a little management, found access to the vault of Henry VIII., where they finally lodged the corpse of their ill-fated sovereign. The hearse was borne by the officers of the garrison, the four lords supporting the pall, and the Bishop of London following; and in this manner was the son of James the First, on Friday, the 9th February, silently, and without other solemnity than of sighs and tears, committed to the earth, the velvet pall being thrown into the vault over the coffin, to which was affixed in lead the following inscription.

KING CHARLES, 1648.

As we love candour in an author and mercy in a woman, we do not admire the spirit of these volumes. There prevails through-

out a sullen, uncharitable temper, frowning on the royal cause, exaggerating what is bad, and concealing nearly all that is good, in the history and character of the unfortunate prince. The reader too will bewail the almost entire want of authorities in these "*Memoirs of the Court of Charles the First.*" Most of the statements are, indeed, perfectly familiar, and require no warrant from secret records or newly-discovered documents; but there are, at the same time, certain portions of the narrative which would appear less incredible were they better vouched.

---

**ART. IV.—***A Practical Exposition of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans.* By the Rev. Robert Anderson. Perpetual Curate of Trinity Chapel, Brighton. London. Hatchard. 1833.

It is almost enough to weigh down the spirit of a man, first to think of the monumental loads of controversy which have been raised, upon the ground of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans; and, then, to reflect that a great portion of all this weariness and toil might, probably, have been spared, if all expositors had steadily kept in mind the *main* object which, throughout, was manifestly in the thoughts of the Apostle himself. Which object we apprehend to have been, to satisfy both Jew and Greek, that that there was no sort of necessity for the Gentiles to pass through the avenue of Judaism, to the spiritual Canaan of the Gospel. To us, at the present day, this truth is so obvious, that it requires some considerable effort to imagine the state of mind which could ever have raised a difficulty upon the subject. It is, nevertheless, unfortunately notorious that, in the days of St. Paul, the question *was* actually one of tremendous difficulty: of such difficulty that the Apostles themselves found it no easy matter to come to an agreement upon it. To tell a Jew that the rest of the world were entitled to come into covenant with God, on equal terms with the chosen people; that circumcision profited nothing nor uncircumcision; and that a change, which should be equivalent to a new moral creation, was the one, and the only thing needful for all;—to tell a Jew this, was almost like telling him that the order of nature was to be confounded. For, in his judgment, the order of nature was not more immutable, than all the counsels of God with regard to the sons of Abraham according to the flesh. To declare that the mercies of God should be extended to the uncircumcised, was like taking the children's bread and casting it to the dogs. We really have considerable doubts whether the care which is now lavished by some idolatrous

people upon sacred bulls, and apes, and monkeys, is much more revolting to our apprehensions, than the honour bestowed upon the Gentiles by the Gospel Dispensation was to the feelings of many an inveterate and pharisaic Israelite. The cases, indeed, are not altogether parallel. But they are so far parallel as this,—that, in the estimation of any *very bigoted* Jew, the Gentiles were, in worth and dignity, but little better than the brutes that perish. He had no more notion of a comprehensive and *catholic* scheme of mercy, than a fanatical Musselman, at the present day, has any notion that an uncircumcised Christian *dog* shall enter into the paradise of the prophet. To imagine and to maintain such a scheme, was a species of *liberalism*, which amounted, in his opinion, to positive impiety. Even those of the privileged and chosen race, who had yielded to every other change implied in the Christian œconomy, found *this* change almost too much for their belief. And hence it was, that even the Church at Rome, whose faith was illustrious throughout the earth, was nevertheless torn to pieces by a bitter controversy relative to this very matter. The Gentile converts claimed a full equality of privileges with the Hebrew Christians. And this claim the Hebrew Christians resisted, as wholly inadmissible on any other terms, than those of a compliance with certain requisitions of the Mosaic system, and, more especially, with that of circumcision. And hence, too, it was that a most elaborate process of argument and exposition became needful for the purpose of composing this unseemly and afflicting strife. And such a process we actually have before us in St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans.

In making this statement, nothing, of course, is further from our thoughts, than to disparage the importance of this grand and sacred monument of apostolic teaching. For, although the point more immediately at issue, is of *comparatively* little moment to the Church of Christ, at the present time, the discussion would, unavoidably, involve many matters of vital interest to the supremacy of the Gospel. We, nevertheless, confidently maintain that the argument can never be fitly understood, without a perpetual reference to the controversy which gave it birth; or without a resolute and steady recollection of the grand position which the Apostle had to establish; namely, that the Gentiles might become Christians, without first becoming Jewish proselytes; and that, when they were Christians, the ordinances and usages of Judaism must be cast away. And we repeat that, if this point had been steadily kept in view by all who have undertaken the exposition of this epistle, it would probably have done for them the office of a pole star; or rather, the office of

the magnetic needle ; and would have kept them clear of much bewildering and devious navigation. And we cordially hope that all who, in future, may launch upon this ocean of inquiry, will consent to take this luminary for their guide.

We are happy to find that the views of Mr. Anderson seem to be essentially in harmony with our own. In his exposition of the 9th chapter, for instance, he very justly observes, that the question there discussed, relative to predestination and election, is totally different from that which has been debated by Christians since the time of St. Augustine.

“ The modern controversy,” he says, “ has not any resemblance whatever to the Jewish notions, and cannot be applied to them. For, in the first place, the Jews extended the promises of God to the whole nation, to every Jew as a descendant of Abraham ; and in the next place, they restricted those promises to their nation only. Now it is these two errors which the Apostle here confutes ; showing, on the one hand, that God's promises were only made to the faithful descendants of Abraham ; and, on the other hand, that God is equally the God of the Jews and the Gentiles. The first covenant was broken by their common father Adam ; and the promises of forgiveness are made to all believers, whether among Jews or Gentiles, through the common Mediator, the Head of the New Covenant, Christ Jesus.”

With regard to this statement, it is to be remarked, that the error of the Jew lay not so much in the belief, that the promises of God extended to every descendant of Abraham ; for this, in a certain sense, was true. The covenant *was* made with the whole nation *collectively* ; so that it was scarcely possible, at any time, to say, of any given portion of the people, that *they* were formally excluded from its benefits. The grand mistake of the Jew was this :—He believed, (and he was, generally, taught so to believe,) that the promises of God could not fail in any one individual instance ; in other words, that no *Hebrew of the Hebrews*, be his personal failings what they might, could ever fall finally away from the favour of God. Whereas, the truth, as dictated by common sense and common equity, is manifestly this,—that the promises of God, as involved in the covenant, must necessarily fail of their accomplishment, towards all who shall have failed to perform *their part*. So that, ultimately and eventually, the result will be the same, as if the *faithful* and the *faithful only*, had been originally interested in the covenant : except, indeed, that the unfaithful will be liable to deeper condemnation than if the covenant and the promises had never been.

Again, Mr. Anderson's exposition of the 8th chapter is, in like manner, untainted with the spirit of the predestinarian dispute. It is, indeed, very animated and spirit-stirring. It is,



evidently, the product of a mind *saturated* with the most blessed influences of Christianity; of a heart on which the love of God and man appears to have been shed abroad by the Holy Ghost. But the zeal which pervades is of no polemic temper. As to doctrinal statement, if there is any one point on which we are disposed to differ from him, it is this; that he seems, (if we may judge from a passage produced by him from Archbishop Leighton), to consider the finally effectual calling of Christians, as the only calling which St. Paul had in contemplation in the celebrated passage of this chapter (viz. v. 28—30.) Every one, of course, is aware that this point has engendered abundance of doubtful disputation. And yet, to us, we confess, it does seem clear enough, that the Apostle is not, at least in this place, thinking of any distinction between the finally *effective*, and finally *ineffective* call. He is not speaking of the ultimate destiny of one class of Christians, as compared with that of another class of Christians. He is speaking, generally, of the design and purpose with which *all* Christians are called of God,—namely, that they may be conformed to the image of His Son. That the calling will *eventually* turn out to be effectual in some cases, and ineffectual in others, is, of course, indisputable. But the contrast between such cases respectively, was not then in the Apostle's mind. The only contrast in his thoughts was, between the condition of those who professed the Gospel, in obedience to the call, and those who did not. And with reference to the former, he speaks (as the Apostles very frequently speak) of Christianity as it would be, if it had its perfect work; and of Christians as *they* would be, if they were all faithful and true to the gracious purposes for which the Gospel was sent. God, of course, foreknew every individual, whether Jew or Gentile, who was to embrace and make profession of the Gospel. And his object was that all such persons should be conformed to the image of Christ. This was the purpose to which they were predestinated, or pre-ordained. And this purpose could not be accomplished, unless they were first called or invited. And with those who were so called, the pre-ordained process was, that they should first be justified by faith in his son, and then, through a course of sanctification, advanced to glory. Of this number, many, it is true, would fail to make their calling and election finally sure. But the fate of such persons does not here seem to enter into the contemplation of the Apostle.

Conformable to this view, is the language of the Apostle in c. ix. 23, 24, where he speaks of God, as "making known the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy, which he had afore prepared unto glory; *even us, whom he hath called*, not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles." Nothing can be more



general than this language. It manifestly points, not to any peculiar portion of the Christian body, selected from the rest, as vessels of mercy; but to the whole assembly of Jews and Greeks who should be separated from the rest of the world, by their profession of that Gospel, which placed the attainment of glory within their reach. And, accordingly, it is said, in 2 Tim. i. 8, 9, that God "hath saved us, and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works," (and, therefore not according to the notions entertained by the Jews,) "but according to his purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus, before the world began:" which "purpose and grace," had no exclusive reference either to Jew or Gentile.

All those, in short, who openly profess the religion of Christ, are said, in the idiom of Scripture, to be predestined unto glory, because they have been brought, by the providential and determinate counsel of God, into the way which leadeth unto glory: just as men are often said to be *saved*, when they are put in possession of the appointed, or predestined, means of salvation. How far their perseverance in that way may be connected with the Divine Decrees, is a matter respecting which, as we contend, nothing has been revealed to us. And if so, it becomes us to lay our hand upon our lips, instead of rushing in, and striving to unroll the volume of God's secret counsels. And such, in effect, we presume, is the persuasion of Mr. Anderson. We collect as much from the general tenor of his meditations; which are as abhorrent as possible from the hard and austere aspect of the predestinarian theology, and tend to the suppression of every uncharitable thought, or contentious feeling.

Having lighted on the eighth chapter, we cannot forbear to express our delight at the manner in which Mr. Anderson has treated two very interesting and solemn subjects,—namely, the witness of the Spirit;—and the groanings of the whole creation beneath the burden of sin. With regard to the former of these subjects, he cordially adopts the sound, vigorous, and wholesome exposition of Bishop Bull. He represents the witness of the Spirit, not as a solitary testimony; not as a voice like that which hath often spoken to the ear of Mysticism or Superstition; but as a joint testimony: a testimony in which our own spirits and consciences have their share.

"We must have," says Mr. Anderson, "both the inward and the outward sign of grace. The inward sign is a heart disposed in all things to obey God's blessed will. The outward signs are acts of cheerful obedience, conformable to that disposition. Both these signs must invariably concur. When we have the evidence of our own spirits that we do in-

deed love the Law of God; and when we have the evidence of the Holy Spirit working in us, by obedience: when we both love and obey the commands of God, and feel our hearts continually drawn towards Him as to a loving father; we cannot want any thing further to assure us that we are the children of God."

The passage respecting the Groans of Nature is understood by Mr. Anderson precisely as we understand it;—as it must, surely, be understood by all who have but tasted of the spirit of the holy oracles;—as it is understood by the author of the *Christian Year*, whose harp always sounds to us as if it had first been tuned in heaven by angelic hands, and had by them been consigned to a "chief musician" on earth, anxious only to prepare for joining in the celestial melodies hereafter. The whole style and manner of the Sacred writings directs us to the true interpretation of the Apostle's language. The Scriptures perpetually speak of things that are greatly needed, as if they were, likewise, vehemently desired: and further, they give both heart and voice to the whole creation, whether living or lifeless. The land is often said to mourn because of the iniquity and transgressions of the people. "The gates of Judah languish" in the day of calamity and rebuke. And again, in seasons of gladness, "the mountains and the hills break forth into singing, and the trees of the field clap their hands" for joy. In the same spirit it is, that the Messiah is called the "Desire of all Nations," for all nations stood in urgent need of the Messiah; though multitudes may have been personally unconscious of their own spiritual wants. And such is the style of the Apostolic language here. The whole creation labours and struggles in pain, under the curse entailed on sin. It cries out for very disquietness and bitterness, as if invoking the promised deliverance,—as if anxious to share in the blessedness which awaits the children of God. The holy psalmist hears the voice of the firmament declaring the glory of the Lord. The Apostle, on the contrary, when pondering on the triumph of evil, seems to listen, in spirit, to the groans and cries of an agonizing world. And who is there, at this day, that can look upon the overflowings of ungodliness, and gaze upon "the dark and cruel places of the earth," without feeling something within him,

Which bids us see, in heaven and earth,  
In all things fair around,  
Strong yearnings for a blest new birth,  
With sinless glories crown'd ?\*

We cannot refrain from subjoining the reflections of Mr. Anderson on the gracious offices of the Spirit in "helping our in-

\* Keble's *Christian Year*, 4th Sunday after Trinity.

firmities, and interceding for us with groanings that cannot be uttered."

"The Holy Spirit," he observes, "sometimes excites in the children of God such ardency of devotion, and such vehement compunction, that their hearts are too full for utterance. The prayer of the believer is often the unutterable groanings of a heart which deeply feels its misery, its poverty, and its impotence. But are these groanings concealed from God. No, says the Apostle, *He that searcheth the heart, knoweth the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the Saints, according to the will of God.*" If it is the Holy Spirit who, Himself, prayeth within us, assuredly He who gave the Holy Spirit to his children, must know what is the mind of the Spirit. *He that searcheth the heart* knows, therefore, that the prayers of his children do not proceed from their own natural desires, but that they are conformable to His most holy and blessed will."

Our readers will immediately perceive how admirably these reflections harmonize with those of Professor Stuart, cited by us in our last Number,\* more especially with the following.

"The soul can (sometimes) only vent itself in sighs, the meaning of which language is too feeble to express. Often we do not know enough of the consequences or designs of present trials and sufferings, even to venture on making a definite request with regard to them; because we do not know whether relief for them is best or not. The humble Christian, who feels his need of chastisement, will very often be brought to such a state. Then, what a high and precious privilege it is, that our unutterable sighs should be heard and understood by Him who searcheth our hearts! Who can read this without emotion? Such are the blessings purchased for sinners by redeeming blood! Such the consolations which flows from the throne of God, for a groaning and dying world!"

It is quite impossible for us to follow Mr. Anderson throughout his exposition. We must confine ourselves, inevitably, to desultory notices. We, accordingly, take a retrograde movement to the fourth chapter; the twenty-fifth verse of which is understood by Mr. Anderson in the sense contended for by Bishop Horseley. It is with the profoundest diffidence that we venture to cast the slightest shade of doubt over any interpretation put forth by that giant of divinity. We nevertheless must honestly avow, that we have some misgivings respecting the soundness of his criticism in the present instance. The Bishop maintains, that, as our Lord's death was the consequence of our sins, so his resurrection was the consequence of our justification. The words of the Apostle are—*ὅς παρεδόθη ΔΙΑ τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν, καὶ ἠγέρθη ΔΙΑ τὴν δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν.* And it would be absurd, says the Bishop, to suppose that the same word could be used, in the same sen-

\* Brit. Crit. for Oct. 1833, p. 442.

tence, in dissimilar and opposite significations. It can no more be said that our justification was accomplished by the resurrection of Christ, than that our sins are produced by his death. And he concludes the doctrine of the text to be, that our justification being completed by the death of Christ, his resurrection followed inevitably, and of course; since it cannot be imagined that he should be detained in the grave, after he had done and suffered all that was necessary for man's redemption.

It may, however, we think, be reasonably doubted, whether all this *symmetry* of style is to be looked for in the writings of St. Paul; or in any except the most laboured and polished compositions. It is true that, according to the usual and ordinary acceptance of this passage, the preposition, *διὰ*, will not have precisely the same meaning in both members of the sentence. In the former, it will denote the consequence of something that has gone before; in the latter, the requisite preliminary to something that was to follow. Thus—"because we have sinned, Christ died; because we *must be justified*, Christ rose again:"—or, "on account of our sins, Christ died; on account (or, for the sake) of our justification, Christ rose from the dead." But this double sense of the same word is by no means without example. An instance of nearly the same kind occurs in the Nicene Creed—*τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς ἄνθρωπος, καὶ δι' ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα ἐκ τῶν ὕρανων*: for in fact, the sins of *us men* were the cause which brought Christ down from heaven, and our salvation was the consequence of his coming. And yet this different use of the preposition, *διὰ*, can scarcely be considered as a violation of grammatical, or even of rhetorical propriety. The sense of the passage of St. Paul may, therefore, we apprehend, still be that which has usually been assigned to it; namely, "the sins of men *required*, or made it necessary that Christ should die; their justification required that he should rise again:" in other words, the sufferings of Christ were requisite as an atonement to the Divine Justice for the offences of mankind; his resurrection was requisite to secure to them the benefit of that atonement; requisite, both as a manifestation of his divine character, authority, and power, and as a step towards his assumption of the office of a mediator at the right hand of God. Both were indispensable proceedings in the œconomy of man's redemption. And here we may remark, that the view taken of this matter by Chrysostom seems to be essentially conformable to our own; for he considers whatever was done for our sins, as likewise done for our justification. His words are—*ὁρὰ πως, πῇν αἰτίαν εἰπὼν τῆ θανάτου, τὴν αὐτὴν καὶ ἀπόδειξιν τῆς ἀναστάσεως ποιεῖται*. —Hom. xiv. in Rom. ad loc.

We repeat, however, that we offer our dissent from the opinion

of Bishop Horseley with becoming hesitation. And, at all events, it is pleasing to observe that Mr. Anderson, instead of wasting much time or thought upon such critical niceties, is anxious only to derive from the text in question all the practical edification which it so richly supplies.

“Behold your Saviour,” he says, “*delivered for your offences*, and pray that, with your hearts awakened to a full sense of the evil and the desert of sin, you may look habitually to the Lamb, without blemish and without spot, which taketh away the sins of the world.”

And again—

“View him, secondly, as *raised again for your justification*. Contemplate the Lord Jesus Christ thus rising from the grave, and bringing back with him the pardon which he had sealed with his own blood. Contemplate him now, when, instead of executing wrath upon his enemies, he sends again the offer of peace and reconciliation to all, and takes upon himself to be their mediator and intercessor, as he had been their sacrifice. . . . The most incredulous of his enemies desired him only to come down from the cross, and they would believe him. But how much better reason had they to believe him, when he came, not from the cross, but from the prison of the grave! How unanswerable was the testimony of God's love to mankind, when his only-begotten and well-beloved Son thus came forth from the grave, to proclaim and to confirm, to all ages, the pardon which he had purchased for a guilty world!”

The seventh chapter is one which has furnished a most ample contingent to the service of controversy. It has been hotly questioned, for example, whether St. Paul, in the latter part of it, is speaking strictly in his own person, as already reclaimed from the bondage of sin, by the Gospel; or, whether he is merely describing the conflicts of a spirit sufficiently awakened to be sensible of its slavery, but as yet imperfectly enlightened as to the only means of escape from it. We very much suspect that St. Paul himself would be extremely astonished—and, perhaps, not a little vexed—if he could witness the piles of disquisition which have been wasted on this question. For ourselves, we can only say, that if we had never heard that a syllable of controversy had been vented on the subject, we doubt whether our own sagacity would have been sufficient to direct us to the difficulty. To our perceptions, nothing can well be more clear than the course of the Apostle's thoughts. He is endeavouring (if we comprehend him rightly) to point out the necessity of the deliverance wrought for us by the Gospel; and in order to accomplish this, he sets forth, in his own very peculiar and emphatic way, the struggles of a depraved but thoughtful mind under the unmitigated dominion of the law. And how does he finish the representation?—why, with precisely the exclamation that might be expected from one who

had been suffering under the conflict between a keen perception of the excellence of the law, and the violence of his own ill-governed propensities—*O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death?*—that is, who shall rescue me from the deathlike disorder and corruption, which seems to cleave to the very clay of which I am compounded? And then, recollecting his own deliverance from this state, he bursts out into a strain of thanksgiving—*I thank God, through Jesus Christ our Lord.* All this, indeed, is spoken by the Apostle, throughout, as in his own person. But this is precisely in the style of St. Paul. Nay, it is precisely in the style of every ardent mind, when anxious to illustrate important truth in the most vivid and striking, and, at the same time, in the least offensive manner. Nothing more powerfully aids the freedom and the animation of a moral or religious teacher, than the appearance of merely representing his own case.

We have no room to examine the various objections which have been started to this view of the passage in question. There is one among them, however, which we cannot abstain from noticing. We are sometimes told that it cannot be said of any but a sincere and confirmed believer, that he delights in the Law of God, after the inward man. Now, in answer to this, we would remark, that a much more emphatic sense is frequently given by interpreters to the word *συνήδομαι*, in the 22d verse, than necessarily belongs to it. It is usually supposed to imply a positive and cordial delight. St. Chrysostom, however, thought otherwise. He considers it as implying little more than acquiescence, or, at most, approbation. For his words are these—*τὸ δὲ ἐστὶ, συνήδομαι;—ὁμολογῶ ὡς καλῶς ἔχοντι.*—(Hom. ad loc.) And is this a feeling beyond the reach of any but a mature believer in the Gospel? Has there not been many a heathen capable of admiration—reluctant and despairing admiration, perhaps—of the most sublime models of virtue, purity, self-denial, and devotion? Is there not many a man, at this day, though but slightly touched, to all appearance, by the heart-searching influences of the Gospel, yet struck with powerful emotions of self-reproach by an exhibition of the beauty of holiness? None but the believer, indeed, can say, in the spirit of the holy psalmist, *Lord, what love have I unto thy law!* But the majesty of the law will often command the unwilling homage of many, who are habitually betrayed by their lusts into rebellion against its authority.

But then, it has been asked, does the believer know nothing of this fearful conflict? Is the law in his members so completely subdued that it ceases to war against the law of his mind? Unquestionably the believer *has* a warfare still to accomplish; for



the struggle which the Apostle describes is one which never wholly ceases in this life: so that the firmest believer may find the description here given by the Apostle, at least partially verified in his own moral history. But still the law in his members, though it may agitate and harass him, (and this, at times, almost *beyond measure and above strength*,) can hardly be said to *bring him into captivity to the law of sin*. From this captivity the faithful disciple of the cross hath been delivered, by the power of Christ that dwelleth in him. He is, therefore, no longer a prisoner striving to burst his chains, or making vain efforts against the walls of his dungeon. He is a combatant fighting the good fight under the banners of his Saviour, though frequently with fainting heart and feeble knees. This combat, indeed, is one which the Apostle often triumphantly describes. But it does not appear to us that he had it solely, or principally, in contemplation here.

In a word, then, it does appear to us, *first*, that St. Paul is here describing a struggle, which is, *more or less*, incident to human nature, in all the varieties and all the stages of its moral condition,—that of hardened depravity alone excepted. *Secondly*, that he had more particularly in view the moral strife, as it works in the heart of the yet unconverted man. But, *lastly*, that his description is, in some particulars, fearfully applicable to the case of the established Christian. But here it must be remembered, that the conflict which yet remaineth to the believer, is, in many instances, still more painful and appalling than the abortive efforts of the struggling captive. And it is so, precisely because the moral sensibilities of the confirmed Christian are infinitely more exalted than those of the man who feels much of the beauty and majesty of God's Holy Law, but is not yet fully acquainted with its inviolable sacredness. The commandment of God hath so purified the moral vision of the believer, that he is often well nigh shaken to pieces by the sense of sinfulness, which still haunts him like an apparition, and seems to stand in the way for an adversary against him. And hence, probably, it is that many a sensitive and anxious Christian has found, in this passage of St. Paul, nothing but a description of the *believer's* agonies and perplexities. And we have no doubt that it is this consideration which has inclined Mr. Anderson to the same line of exposition, as the only one which can bring the Christian to an adequate view of the toil and peril of his warfare. And truly, the error (if it be an error) would be of slight account, if all expositors had, like him, been content to use the words of the Apostle, only as excitements to watchfulness and perseverance.

“Put on,” he says; “the whole armour of God, and remember that it is never to be laid aside until others shall be called upon to put on your



shrouds. *Though the believer may not live in sin, still sin will live in the believer.* His strong sins, indeed, will every day become weaker and weaker, and his weak graces will grow stronger and stronger. But yet his weak graces will never be perfectly strengthened, nor will his strong sins ever be perfectly subdued, as long as he is in this life. Yea, that 'infection of nature which remaineth, even in the regenerate,' will lead him continually to adopt the language of the Apostle, and to say—*O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death!*"

We must now take leave of Mr. Anderson, which we do with the conviction that we have been conversing with one, all whose faculties are intensely devoted to the holy work of the ministry. It is, perhaps, too much to expect, that this, or any exposition of the Epistle to the Romans, should meet with the unqualified and unanimous assent of the critical or theological world. Besides, a complete, profound, and searching discussion of every question which arises out of this portion of Scripture, is an undertaking which swells far over the embankments of any channel, which a pastoral expositor can trace out for himself. Of the work before us, however, we can honestly say, that,—whether it fully satisfies the spirit of criticism, or whether it does not,—it exemplifies in almost every page that holy earnestness, that ardent desire for the salvation of human souls, which is the crown and glory of all pastoral teaching and ministration.

---

ART. V.—*History of Arabia, Ancient and Modern : containing a Description of the Country—an Account of its Inhabitants, Antiquities, Political Condition, and Early Commerce—the Life and Religion of Mohammed—the Conquests, Arts, and Literature of the Saracens—the Caliphs of Damascus, Bagdad, Africa, and Spain—the Civil Government and Religious Ceremonies of the Modern Arabs—Origin and Suppression of the Wahabees—the Institutions, Character, Manners and Customs of the Bedouins ; and a Comprehensive View of its Natural History.* By Andrew Crichton. Being Part XIII. of the Edinburgh Cabinet Library.

THE general question of the state and prospects of English literature appears to us a subject of far deeper and more pressing importance than it is usually considered. Our literary system, like every thing else about us, is undergoing a rapid change, and yet few persons trouble their heads about the matter ; very few indeed know enough to understand it. Men see the surface smooth, and they think nothing of the troubles that are boiling underneath ; they deem the aspects of the present favourable, and they

care nothing how the resources of the future may be anticipated and destroyed : they are full of chuckling congratulations about the prodigious spread of instruction for the multitude ; but they never ask themselves how long the solid materials are likely to be supplied, out of which these popular vehicles of information are compiled and manufactured.

There are many evils connected with the new modes of composition and publication, of which the effects, we apprehend, will be more visible in a few years, than they are at this immediate moment. We just throw out the following objections as they occur to us, not for the sake of indulging our spleen, for we have really none to indulge ; but for the sake of directing public attention to the inquiry, in the hope that some expedient may be devised, by which the good, which we are eager to acknowledge, may be still attained, but without the concomitant mischief, which may soon neutralize, if it does not overbalance it.

1. The present system of " Family Libraries," and " National Libraries," and " Cabinet Libraries," and all sorts of Libraries, and all sorts of Encyclopædias, is yet, in spite of its colossal pretensions, utterly destitute of true wisdom and comprehensiveness. It exhibits, after all, an incongruous mass without unity or harmonization. Treatises upon all conceivable subjects are thrown up, one after another, as if by the wheels of a lottery, or from " the yeast of waves," without any consecutive order, without any reference or application, each to each. And thus the knowledge acquired by the mind, instead of being combined, and dove-tailed into a well-adjusted or well-amalgamated whole, must consist merely of a number of salient points and jumbled impressions.

2. The present system is essentially a system of compilation and plagiarism. In *Macadamising* the road to science, men are perpetually employed in breaking up the stones which do not belong to them. Nine-tenths, at the least, of the cheap and hasty productions which are now put forth in haste, from the price of a halfpenny or a penny upwards, are got up at second-hand by second-rate or third-rate *operatives*, for the mere object of a quick and extensive sale. There is almost nothing absolutely new. But the handsome, though it may be somewhat cumbrous, furniture of our ancestors is taken to pieces, and modern chairs and tables are constructed out of it ; and if the backs are gay and the face shining, who is to complain that the joints are weak and the legs rickety, and the whole just fit to deck out a lodging-house ? Modern fabrics are to be run up without much of mortar or cement, out of the bricks of some olden edifice ; and as the lease is but a short one, it matters nothing, provided only they can be made to serve their purpose and last their time.

3. The necessary consequence, or rather companion, of this state of things, is that our literature is becoming superficial in the same proportion as it has become multifarious; and loses in depth almost as much it gains in expansion. Alas, who will think of making for himself a *κτῆμα ἐς αἰὲν*, or building up an enduring monument with the labours of a life; if the produce of the brain is to be pilfered without compunction, and, when properly lightened and rarified, fly abroad upon the wings of a penny or three half-penny, or twopenny magazine? The chaster graces of style must be sacrificed to coarse and palpable effects; and the polish and finish of composition must eventually vanish away, as it is transmitted from men of original minds to others, whose province is to work up and adapt to popular use the thoughts and discoveries of their masters. Just as we come to wood-cut engravings, we come also to a *wood-cut* literature.

Some of the foregoing observations have perhaps been overcharged, both in the drawing and the colouring. But we shall not retract them, because the very exaggeration may make our meaning more conspicuous. Our impression certainly is, that the interests of literature and knowledge will, in the long run, suffer materially and fatally, if all existing causes are to operate without counteraction; and unless some higher and more substantial encouragement shall be afforded to the production of profound and elaborate works; unless a man's right to his intellectual capital shall be secured to him; and therefore unless the laws relating to literary property shall be altered and amended. We write, however, with the sole aim of eliciting truth, and not with any view of making accusations. Few things, too, would grieve us more, than to be suspected of enmity to the progress of improvement and intelligence; when the first, and most earnest, and most deeply-rooted wish of our hearts is—the utmost possible communication of a sound, and systematic, and valuable instruction. We have our doubts, not about the *end*, but about the *means*; and we sometimes fear, that, while men are eager to snatch an immediate benefit, a positive and growing injury is overlooked. Our meaning will be evident; as, after saying a few words upon the *libraries* in general, we pass on to a critical examination of the volumes before us, which will have given the immediate occasion to these remarks, and will partly furnish their illustration.

Of larger and more imposing monopolies we may speak in another place, but we cannot help considering these libraries as an attempt at monopoly in a small way. We do not mean, when they are confined to some particular line of subjects, but when they aspire to be universal and indiscriminate. Their tendency is to merge individual authorship under the direction of two or three

editors or publishers, in somewhat the same way as individual authorship will perhaps be merged, or have to contend at an infinite disadvantage under the operation of the two societies for the promotion, the one of Christian, and the other of useful knowledge. And the worst is, that they have not any definite shape, like an alphabetical or methodized encyclopædia, but that they absolutely outrage all Aristotelian rules, and have neither beginning, nor middle, nor end. These libraries might stop to-morrow, or extend to as many volumes as Richard Heber's; and yet there would be no legitimate reason at one time more than at another, for either their stoppage or their extension. A "Library," or a "Cabinet Cyclopædia,"—or any other collection of volumes connected by that most magnificent of all links, the *same binding*—commences, we will suppose, with a life of "Napoleon," or "Byron;" and then, number two is a treatise upon some particular department of science, and number three is an account of certain voyages and travels, and number four is a *preliminary* dissertation upon science in general; and so on *ad infinitum*. Can any thing be more preposterous than this? and yet is not this picture, ridiculous as it seems, realized in a hundred instances at the present day? And with the exception of a few contributions, not in their best manner, from a few eminent authors, just to give the thing a start, are not the whole collections little better than bundles of piracy and trash? Why, a man would be ashamed of himself, if he did not marshal his books upon his own shelves in better sequence, and connection, and juxtaposition. We have only time to make one humble supplication to the intellectual caterers for that public taste, which they are doing much to vitiate;—to the literary despots who, like Mehemet Ali, would graciously take all imaginable matters under their especial and sovereign protection:—if we must have "*Libraries*" written for us, in the name of common sense let us have them more philosophically arranged.

The two volumes constituting the History of Arabia, ancient and modern, are by no means an unfavourable specimen of their class. An author—and this too is one of the inconveniences of the system—works with a clog about his heels, when he works at a *job* under the direction of another; and therefore we conceive Mr. Crichton capable of higher things, if left entirely to himself. But the work has been loudly praised; and not altogether beyond its merits. The subject is interesting, and the manner of handling it agreeable enough. Arabia is, in fact, a land which, while it invites the curiosity of every one, must for a Christian be invested with an almost indescribable attraction. The origin of the people, their habits, and their destiny—the localities of the country—its wildernesses of sand, and the seas and mountains

upon its border—have all a relation to those stupendous events and those wondrous prophecies which are interwoven with the very frame-work of our belief. In later ages, again, Arabia is well calculated to rivet our attention, as being the birth-place of that false prophet, and the great nursery of that potent fanaticism, which at one period, to a merely human vision, or to an understanding unenlightened and unsupported by the promises of Scripture, seemed likely utterly to overthrow the Gospel of Jesus of Nazareth, and exercise a sanguinary supremacy over the nations of the earth. And the truth is, that the principal object which directed us to these volumes, was a wish to see in what manner the vast subject of Mohammed and Mohammedanism had been treated. For a good view of the Arabian imposture, brought down to the present times, was and is still wanting; and certainly neither the strange work of Mr. Foster, nor the miserable fragment of an account which was published by the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge, nor any other production which we have lately seen, can be deemed adequate to supply the deficiency.

We cannot compliment Mr. Crichton so far as to say, that he has entirely accomplished what we conceive to be desirable. His strong point seems to be a certain neatness of description, rather than any philosophical depth or grandeur of conception: and the latter portion of his labours appears somewhat hurried and abridged, probably because the space of two volumes was the limit assigned by his employers. He might also contend, and not without some justice, that a very enlarged survey of the present aspect of Mohammedanism, and the probable futurity which awaits it, would not fairly be comprised into a popular history of the ancient and modern Arabs.

We shall therefore look at Mr. Crichton's book as it is, instead of blaming him for not giving what he has not, perhaps, intended to give: at the same time he does profess much; he does make high pretensions: and we feel entitled and called upon to try him by the lofty standard which is taken in his own preface. He tells us at vol. i. page 7, with considerable grandiloquence—

“That the author has succeeded in verifying doubts or reconciling anachronisms, which perplexed the ablest Arabian antiquaries,—Pocock, Reiske, and De Sacy,—it would be presumption in him to assert. He has employed every means in his power, however, to discover the truth. For this purpose the Oriental writers,—Abulfeda, Tabiri, Masoudi, Hamza, Nuvaïri, Abulfarage, and others who record the transactions of these remote ages,—have been carefully perused; nor have those inci-

dental notices and allusions been overlooked which occur in the pages of the Greek and Roman classics."—*Crichton*, p. 7.

He tells us, again, that the accounts of naturalists, and geographers, and travellers have been studied. "Of these sources of information the author has not neglected to avail himself, and while acknowledging his obligations to the distinguished travellers Niebuhr and Burckhardt, he ought also to state that he has not omitted to consult the more recent surveys of Chesney, Kent, and Owen.—p. 6. In another department of his work he has been enabled, from the valuable labours of Major Price, to rectify some errors, as well as to illustrate some points more fully than has been done by Ockley and Marigny, or even by the Arabian annalists Abulfeda or Elmacin."—pp. 8, 9.

Now from all these statements we have surely a right to expect, if not much perhaps of absolute originality, at least a good deal of individual and independent research: we have a right to expect that the materials, thus collected from a multitude of sources, would be worked up into a fresh tissue in their due harmony and proportion; that the rays thus pouring in from various quarters would be so concentrated as to throw a fresh flood of light over the whole of the Arabian peninsula: we have a right to expect, in short, that "The History of Arabia, Ancient and Modern," &c. &c. (vide the long catalogue of particulars in the title page almost worthy of George Robins), would have been at least *re-written*, after a careful digest and collation of all previous accounts.

But what is the fact? Mr. Crichton and our readers in general will bear in mind that *we* do *not* pretend to have examined the *whole* matter of the two volumes with the same elaborate diligence. Mr. Crichton would be indeed unfortunate if we passed sentence upon all the rest, judging with a dogmatic inflexibility by the part which we *have* elaborately examined. Of the rest then let us be understood as saying nothing: only, if the part selected *be* a fair sample of the whole, we should be sorry, ourselves, to have written Mr. Crichton's book with Mr. Crichton's preface. We took up these volumes, as we have already hinted, chiefly with a view of investigating what had been written about "The Life and Religion of Mohammed," which, according to Mr. Crichton—

"form a curious and important episode in Arabian history; as giving rise to one of the most wonderful revolutions that the world has ever beheld. In treating of these, it has been the object of the present writer to give a fair representation of both, without being swayed by any of those prejudices and apprehensions which have led some authors to speak of the character of that remarkable personage, and the institutions of which he was the founder, in a tone of such uncharitable rancour, as to bring into suspicion the veracity of their statements. While



shunning the bitter invectives of one class of biographers, he has avoided the panegyric strain of others, who have endowed the Apostle of the Koran with all the miraculous qualities which Eastern credulity has gravely ascribed to him. Having no hypothesis to support, and considering it his province rather to narrate events than to speculate upon them, he has confined himself to a simple record of facts; leaving his readers in general to draw their own conclusions."—*Crichton*, pp. 7, 8.

Here we gravely ask, *what* is this record of facts which is ushered in with so much pomp, and "which is to be moderate and impartial, and to separate the good from the evil of preceding narratives, and to steer its own course between uncharitable rancour and credulous panegyric?" What shall we say, if the gallant vessel thus boldly launched upon the waters, as if her timbers were all fresh, turns out to be nothing more or less than an old seventy-four cut down into a frigate, with a little fresh copper, and fresh paint? It is remarkable that among the number of authorities quoted by Mr. Crichton in his account of Mohammed, the name of Gibbon is seldom mentioned, and scarcely ever without some expression of dissent from his opinions; and yet, as we read on, the very words struck us as familiar to our recollections. Great, however, was our astonishment, when in comparing the *Historian of "Arabia ancient and modern,"* with the *Historian of "The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire,"* we found the biography of Mohammed, not *similar*, but essentially *the same*. We allow that there are some transpositions: we allow that some incidents are related by Mr. Crichton in a more enlarged form than could be afforded by the spirited and rapid narrative of his predecessor: we allow that occasional details are added from the sources and the plans directly specified in Gibbon's *notes*: but not only the great events, and the order of events are the same, for they could not well be different, but the general tone of composition is the same; the colouring is the same: the very extracts from the Koran are the same. Let our readers carefully examine the following passages, and decide according to their own unbiassed judgment. Be it presumed that our extracts are made almost at random, as we have not room for one quarter of the demonstration that might be adduced either from the life of Mohammed himself, or from the chronicle of the conquests of the succeeding caliphs.

Compare the accounts of the Ali's call to be the vizier of the prophet.

"In the fourth year he assumed the prophetic office, and resolving to impart to his family the light of divine truth, he prepared a banquet, a lamb, as it is said, and a bowl of milk, for the entertainment of forty guests of the race of Hashem. 'Friends and kinsmen,' said Mahomet



to the assembly, 'I offer you, and I alone can offer, the most precious of gifts, the treasures of this world and of the world to come. God has commanded me to call you to his service. 'Who among you will support my burden? Who among you will be my companion and my vizir?' No answer was returned, till the silence of astonishment, and doubt, and contempt, was at length broken by the impatient courage of Ali, a youth in the fourteenth year of his age. 'O prophet, I am the man: whosoever rises against thee, I will dash out his teeth, tear out his eyes, break his legs, rip up his belly. O prophet, I will be thy vizir over them.' Mahomet accepted his offer with transport, and Abu Taleb was ironically exhorted to respect the superior dignity of his son." —*Gibbon*, c. 1,

"The obedient Apostle, accordingly, directed Ali to prepare an entertainment,—a lamb and a bowl of milk,—to which forty guests of the race of Hashem were invited. After some interruption Mohammed addressed the astonished assembly :—' Friends, I this day offer you what no other person in all Arabia can offer,—the most valuable of gifts,—the treasures of this world and of that which is to come. God has enjoined me to call you to his service. Who among you will be my vizier, to share with me the burden and the toils of this important mission, to become my brother, my vicar, and ambassador?' This address was heard with silent surprise; and none seemed disposed to accept the proffered dignity. At length the impatient Ali made answer,—' I, O Prophet, will be your vizier, and obey your commands! Whoever dares to oppose you, I will tear out his eyes, dash out his teeth, break his legs, and rip open his body!' On this burst of enthusiasm, Mohammed caught the youth in his arms with the liveliest demonstrations of affection. 'Behold,' said he, 'my brother and vicegerent! Listen, and obey him.' Shouts of contemptuous laughter followed this romantic installation. The whole company turned their sarcastic eyes on Abu Taleb, as if to inquire whether the rights and honours of a father were to be violated by rendering obedience to the authority of his own son." —*Crichton*, vol. i. pp. 234, 235.

Look again to the description of the Mohammedan Creed, as an incentive to military daring.

"The Arab continued to unite the professions of a merchant and a robber; and his petty excursions for the defence or the attack of a caravan insensibly prepared his troops for the conquest of Arabia. The distribution of the spoil was regulated by a divine law: the whole was faithfully collected in one common mass: a fifth of the gold and silver, the prisoners and cattle, the moveables and immoveables, was reserved by the prophet for pious and charitable uses; the remainder was shared in adequate portions by the soldiers who had obtained the victory or guarded the camp: the rewards of the slain devolved to their widows and orphans; and the increase of cavalry was encouraged by the allotment of a double share to the horse and to the man. From all sides the roving Arabs were allured to the standard of religion and plunder: the apostle sanctified the license of embracing the female captives as their wives

or concubines: and the enjoyment of wealth and beauty was a feeble type of the joys of paradise prepared for the valiant martyrs of the faith. 'The sword,' says Mahomet, 'is the key of heaven and of hell: a drop of blood shed in the cause of God, a night spent in arms, is of more avail than two months of fasting or prayer: whosoever falls in battle, his sins are forgiven: at the day of judgment his wounds shall be resplendent as vermillion, and odoriferous as musk; and the loss of his limbs shall be supplied by the wings of angels and cherubim.' The intrepid souls of the Arabs were fired with enthusiasm: the picture of the invisible world was strongly painted on their imagination; and the death which they had always despised became an object of hope and desire. The Koran inculcates, in the most absolute sense, the tenets of fate and predestination, which would extinguish both industry and virtue, if the actions of man were governed by his speculative belief. Yet their influence in every age has exalted the courage of the Saracens and Turks. The first companions of Mahomet advanced to battle with a fearless confidence; there is no danger where there is no chance: they were ordained to perish in their beds; or they were safe and invulnerable amidst the darts of the enemy."—*Gibbon*, c. l.

"The enthusiasm of the Arabs was thus doubly inflamed, by the hope of plunder and the promise of a sensual paradise. The decrees of an absolute fate, which would extinguish both industry and valour if men were left to the influence of a merely speculative belief, were dexterously turned into instruments for inspiring the disciples of the Koran with the most exalted and reckless courage. The companions of the prophet advanced to battle without fear. As nothing was left to chance, there was no room for danger or dismay. The same inevitable destiny that might have ordained them to perish in their beds, would not overtake them a moment sooner on the field of death, or render their persons more insecure amidst the arrows of the enemy. The lot of all was determined by a fixed and resistless predestination; with this difference, that while the man of peace departed obscure and inglorious, the fallen warrior had before his eyes the crown of martyrdom and the joys of paradise. 'The sword,' exclaimed the military apostle, 'is the key of heaven and of hell! A drop of blood shed in the cause of God, a night spent in arms, is of more avail than two months' fasting or prayer. Whoever falls in battle, his sins are forgiven; at the day of judgment his wounds shall be resplendent as vermillion, and odorous as musk; and the loss of his limbs shall be supplied by the wings of angels and cherubim.' The valiant martyrs of the faith were allowed to anticipate the voluptuous enjoyments of another world, by the license of embracing the female captives as their wives or concubines. The interval of the four sacred months, which had hitherto suspended the fury of the most hostile tribes, was disregarded, that no impediment might retard the victorious Moslems in their mighty career of pillage and proselytism. The distribution of the spoil was regulated by the authority of revelation. The whole plunder of the forage or the battle-field was to be collected in one common mass. A fifth part the prophet reserved to himself for charitable and pious uses; the remainder was to be divided among the

soldiers, including those who guarded the camp as well as those who had been actually engaged. The portion of the slain devolved to their widows and orphans; and to encourage the increase of cavalry each horseman was allotted a double share."—*Crichton*, vol. i. pp. 253—255.

And let the reader just mark the attempt to escape detection by *transposing* the sentences.

Look at another artifice, which, although the quotations ought to be much lengthened, will be made transparent by a couple of sentences.

"Notwithstanding a vulgar prejudice, the gates of heaven will be open to both sexes; but Mahomet has not specified the male companions of the female elect, lest he should either alarm the jealousy of their former husbands, or disturb their felicity, by the suspicion of an everlasting marriage."—*Gibbon*, c. l.

"Notwithstanding the prevalence of this vulgar error, the gates of paradise will be open to both sexes; but whether they shall inhabit the same or separate apartments, is a point yet undecided. Mohammed had too much respect for the fair to teach such humiliating doctrine. His law rejected the negative precept of the Gospel, of 'neither marrying nor giving in marriage;' but he has prudently abstained from specifying the male companions of the female elect, whether they will be united to their earthly spouses, or have paramours of musk created for them; lest, as an ingenious historian has remarked, he should alarm the jealousies of their former husbands, or disturb their felicity by the suspicion of an everlasting union."—*Crichton*, pp. 318, 319.

Here Mr. Crichton thinks to throw dust into our eyes by his *single* reference not to *Gibbon*, but to "*an ingenious historian*."

Compare the following accounts.

"From his establishment at Medina, Mahomet assumed the exercise of the regal and sacerdotal office; and it was impious to appeal from a judge whose decrees were inspired by the divine wisdom. A small portion of ground, the patrimony of two orphans, was acquired by gift or purchase; on that chosen spot he built an house and a mosch, more venerable in their rude simplicity than the palaces and temples of the Assyrian caliphs. His seal of gold, or silver, was inscribed with the apostolic title; when he prayed and preached in the weekly assembly, he leaned against the trunk of a palm-tree; and it was long before he indulged himself in the use of a chair or pulpit of rough timber. After a reign of six years, fifteen hundred Moslems, in arms and in the field, renewed their oath of allegiance; and their chief repeated the assurance of protection till the death of the last member, or the final dissolution of the party. It was in the same camp that the deputy of Mecca was astonished by the attention of the faithful to the words and looks of the prophet, by the eagerness with which they collected his spittle, a hair that dropped on the ground, the refuse water of his lustrations, as if they participated in some degree of the prophetic virtue. 'I have seen,' said he, 'the Chosroes of Persia and the Cæsar of Rome, but never did

I behold a king among his subjects like Mahomet among his companions.' The devout fervour of enthusiasm acts with more energy and truth than the cold and formal servility of courts."—*Gibbon*. c. 1.

"With the functions of temporal sovereignty Mohammed conjoined that of chief priest or pontiff. During his life he was himself the only minister and expounder of his religion. At first, such was the rude simplicity of the age, he used to preach in the mosque at Medina leaning upon a post, the trunk of a palm-tree driven into the ground. Accessions of power and magnificence required more appropriate accommodation; and at length he consented to have a stair or pulpit made, three steps in height,—the uppermost of which was occupied by himself; Abu Beker being seated on the second step; and Omar on the third, with his feet resting on the ground. Tradition asserts, that the first time the prophet ascended the new rostrum, a dismal sound, like the lowing of a camel, issued from the deserted beam, expressive of grief and regret; and that the sympathising apostle, caressing the disconsolate trunk in the most endearing language, restored it to good humour, and impressed it with a conviction of the propriety of their separation.

"Nothing could exceed the respect and veneration in which Mohammed was held by his devoted followers. His wishes were anticipated, his words and looks watched with the utmost attention. Every hair that dropped on the ground was gathered with superstitious care. His spittle was eagerly caught and preserved; and the water in which he had made his ablutions, as if it inherited a sacred virtue from his touch. The ceremonious expressions of allegiance, the formal servility of courts, are cold when compared with this fervour of a blind enthusiasm. 'I have seen,' said Arwa, the deputy of Mecca, who had contemplated the Moslem camp with leisurely astonishment, 'the Khoosroes of Persia and the Cæsars of Rome in all their glory; but never did I behold a king among his subjects like Mohammed in the midst of his companions.'"—*Crichton*, vol. i. pp. 271—273.

Again: take the battle of Beder or Bedr, a distinction without a difference, or the battle of Ohud, or any one of the battles. But it is impossible to go on: or we should have a whole chapter of *Gibbon* to extract. We have only room for the death of the prophet.

"Till the age of sixty-three years, the strength of Mahomet was equal to the temporal and spiritual fatigues of his mission. His epileptic fits, an absurd calumny of the Greeks, would be an object of pity rather than abhorrence; but he seriously believed that he was poisoned at Chaibar by the revenge of a Jewish female. During four years the health of the prophet declined; his infirmities increased; but his mortal disease was a fever of fourteen days, which deprived him by intervals of the use of reason. As soon as he was conscious of his danger, he edified his brethren by the humility of his virtue or penitence. 'If there be any man,' said the apostle from the pulpit, 'whom I have unjustly scourged, I submit my own back to the lash of retaliation. Have I aspersed the reputation of a Musulman? let him proclaim my faults in

the face of the congregation. Has any one been despoiled of his goods? the little that I possess shall compensate the principal and the interest of the debt.' 'Yes,' replied a voice from the crowd, 'I am entitled to three drams of silver.' Mahomet heard the complaint, satisfied the demand, and thanked his creditor for accusing him in this world rather than at the day of judgment. He beheld with temperate firmness the approach of death; enfranchised his slaves (seventeen men, as they are named, and eleven women); minutely directed the order of his funeral, and moderated the lamentations of his weeping friends, on whom he bestowed the benediction of peace. Till the third day before his death, he regularly performed the function of public prayer: the choice of Abubeker to supply his place, appeared to mark that ancient and faithful friend as his successor in the sacerdotal and regal office; but he prudently declined the risk and envy of a more explicit nomination. At a moment when his faculties were visibly impaired, he called for pen and ink to write, or, more properly, to dictate a divine book, the sum and accomplishment of all his revelations: a dispute arose in the chamber, whether he should be allowed to supersede the authority of the Koran; and the prophet was forced to reprove the indecent vehemence of his disciples. If the slightest credit may be afforded to the traditions of his wives and companions, he maintained, in the bosom of his family, and to the last moments of his life, the dignity of an apostle, and the faith of an enthusiast; described the visits of Gabriel, who bade an everlasting farewell to the earth, and expressed his lively confidence, not only of the mercy, but of the favour of the Supreme Being. In a familiar discourse he had mentioned his special prerogative, that the angel of death was not allowed to take his soul till he had respectfully asked the permission of the prophet. The request was granted; and Mahomet immediately fell into the agony of his dissolution: his head was reclined on the lap of Ayesha, the best beloved of all his wives; he fainted with the violence of pain; recovering his spirits, he raised his eyes towards the roof of the house, and, with a steady look, though a faltering voice, uttered the last broken, though articulate, words: 'O God! . . . . . pardon my sins. . . . . Yes, . . . . . I come, . . . . . among my fellow-citizens on high:' and thus peaceably expired on a carpet spread upon the floor."—*Gibbon*, c. i.

"Until his sixty-third year, Mohammed had sustained with unabated vigour the temporal and spiritual fatigues of his mission. The infirmities of age had not impaired his constitution, though his health had suffered a gradual decline. His mortal disease was a fever, of which he was seized in the house of Zainab, one of his wives, while giving directions to Osama to lead an expedition into Palestine to avenge the death of Zaid, who had earned the crown of martyrdom at the battle of Muta. Finding his malady increase, he requested to be conveyed to the mansion of his favourite Ayesha, whose tenderness might sooth his last moments. To her he expressed his serious conviction that he owed the cause of his distemper to the poisoned mutton at Khaibar. For three days he suffered the torture of an intense and insupportable heat, which deprived him at intervals of the use of reason. This paroxysm

was succeeded by a more favourable crisis, and he recovered so far as to officiate at prayers in the mosque. His audience were edified by a penitential acknowledgment of his willingness to make restitution to such as he might have unconsciously wronged. 'If there be any man whom I have unjustly scourged, I offer my back to the lash of retaliation. If I have asperged his reputation, let him proclaim my faults. If I have taken his money, or despoiled him of his goods, I am ready to give the little I possess to compensate his loss. Let my accuser make his demand; it is not my disposition to resent the claims of justice.' 'Yes,' exclaimed a voice from the crowd, 'you owe me three drachms of silver.' Mohammed immediately discharged the debt, and thanked his creditor for accusing him in this world rather than at the day of judgment.

"To his latest hour, and amidst sorrow and suffering, he continued to act the character of the prophet; evincing at the closing scene of mortality the same remarkable fortitude and presence of mind that he had displayed on the field of battle. In one instance only did the violence of disease betray his wandering faculties into a momentary illusion, when he called for pen and ink, that he might write a book for the better instruction of his followers, and to consummate the work of revelation. The proposal was startling, and met with opposition, as the Koran was deemed sufficient: the chamber of sickness was disturbed by an unseasonable dispute, until the dying prophet was forced to reprimand the indecent vehemence of his disciples. Unwilling that his attendants should witness the recurrence of his infirmities, he ordered all persons to be excluded from his apartment; and the last three days of his existence were spent in the exclusive society of Ayesha.

"Tradition, which disfigured his life with romance, has left us to contemplate the circumstance of his death through a cloud of superstitious incense. If we are to place the slightest credit on the evidence of his only companion, he received more incontestable proofs to establish the truth of his mission at its termination than in any former period. Gabriel made regular visits of condolence and inquiry after his health. The angel of death was not permitted to separate his soul from his body till he had respectfully solicited permission to enter the chamber. The request was granted, and the last office performed with all the deference of a servant to the command of his master. When the moment of his departure approached, his head was reclined on the lap of Ayesha; he fainted in the agony of pain, but recovering his spirits, and raising his eyes with a steady look towards the roof of the apartment, he uttered with a faltering voice the following broken and scarcely articulate expressions:—'O God!—pardon me—have pity——Yes,——receive me——among my fellow-citizens on high!' and immediately expired on a carpet spread on the floor."—*Crichton*, vol. i. pp. 286—288.

Now, if our readers are not satisfied, we can only wish that we had more space for quotations: if Mr. Crichton is not satisfied, we can only say that he is insatiable.



These parallel passages, and parallel passages indeed they are, will speak, trumpet-tongued, for themselves. Yet we should not have noticed them, if they had been borrowed with a candid confession of the debt. We *do* notice them, because, as far as we can discern, there is not one word of acknowledgment—or one phrase marked as a quotation—or one reference made to Gibbon throughout.

As to this part, then, of his record, we bring a distinct charge of plagiarism against Mr. Crichton,—plagiarism so palpable, that our confidence in the genuineness of the entire work is altogether shaken, and we think that it is fully borne out by the instances which we have cited. For, notwithstanding the array of other authorities, who can doubt, that any man endued with a common capacity of stringing two sentences together, might have written almost every line with nothing in the world but Gibbon's history before him?\*

And the case appears worse, from the slight changes, as, for example, of synonymous epithets, so manifestly

\* Not only does Mr. Crichton make no mention of Gibbon in giving a list of authorities for his biographical memoir of Mohammed; but he evidently and disingenuously tries to distract attention from Gibbon, and put the reader on a false scent by a long and pedantic list of learned names.

He says in his text, "Though much uncertainty on this subject has been removed by our increased acquaintance with the literature of the East, and a more candid spirit of investigation introduced, there still remains considerable obscurity respecting the personal history of Mohammed. The narratives of his life are broken and disjointed, resting sometimes on equivocal evidence, and very often enveloped in a thick cloud of supernatural wonders, that makes it difficult to separate between earth and heaven, or discriminate the exact bounds of truth and fiction." And then he subjoins in a note, "The authors who have written Lives of Mohammed it would be tedious to enumerate. The best Arabic biography yet discovered is that by Abulfeda, which was translated into Latin in 1723, and illustrated with copious notes by John Gagnier, professor of Arabic at Oxford. This work, for a Mussulman, is candid and judicious. Al Beidawi, Shahrestani, Al Jannabi, Nuairi, Mircond, and most of the other Oriental historians, are full of legends, and not worth noticing here: they have been consulted and copiously used by D'Herbelot and the authors of the Universal History. (Mod. Part, vol. i.) The Lives of Mohammed, not mere translations, but compiled from various authors, are innumerable. That by Dean Prideaux, published in 1697, has been long popular: it is learned but dull, compiled from suspicious authorities, and tainted with prejudice. The one by the Count de Boulainvilliers, which appeared in 1730, is deserving of no credit, either for its sentiments or its consistency with fact. It is a preliminary essay or romance rather than a history, being a mere fragment, and bringing the life of the Prophet only down to the fifth year of his mission. The learned Abbé Maracci prefixed a life, full of bitter invective, to his Translation and Refutation of the Koran (in 1698). Gagnier compiled a biography, in 2 vols., from the Koran and the best Arabic authors, in 1752. He is impartial; but he writes like a Mussulman,—recording facts and fables, miracles and visions, with the same imperturbable solemnity, and without a single remark. That prefixed to Savary's Translation of the Koran is an excellent abridgment of the Prophet's Life."—vol. i. pp. 219, 220.

Al Beidawi! Shahrestani! Al Jannabi! Nuairi! Mircond! Pray, Mr. Crichton have a little mercy upon our feeble intellects! For who, under the stunning influence of all this amazing erudition, can have power to recollect that there is an English author, one Edward Gibbon, who has devoted two chapters of his History to an account of Mahomet and Mahometanism?



made by design : from the thin cloak of alteration, in which there is an endeavour to conceal the identity of the accounts. Nay : we are wrong; the *cloak* is Gibbon's cloak; but Mr. Crichton has attempted to disguise it by putting on other buttons. Why did he not say at once, Mr. Gibbon has described the "fortunes and character of Mohammed so excellently well, that I have preferred to make use of his language, instead of writing the biography again, and writing it worse." A course like this would have spoken more for the literary credit of Mr. Crichton, and not less for the strength of his understanding, and the soundness of his self-knowledge. In short, there are sundry amplifications, but there is scarcely a new idea; scarcely an accession to our previous information, unless we are to be extremely grateful for the change of Mahomet into Mohammed, or Mahommed; and our old friend "Caled" into "Khaled," and "Sophian" into "Sofian," and "Bedoweens" into "Bedouins;" with a diversity of similar metamorphoses, which may perhaps be metamorphosed back by the next traveller who returns to us from the East.

Nevertheless, as Mr. Crichton is evidently a man of talent and acquirement, and as his book is certainly not *below* the average of volumes written under parallel circumstances, we make a victim of him with reluctance and regret. He is the victim of a book-making system, and a book-making age. And, if his work did not happen to be on a subject, upon which, we think, a few observations may be beneficially subjoined, we should have seized and bound some greater and more notorious delinquent. Since, however, we are officiating priests, however humble, in the service of literature, we are compelled, with all possible tenderness, to sacrifice him upon her altar; while we keep our eye upon others, whom we may, perhaps, immolate hereafter upon the same shrine in one great and glorious hecatomb. For we confess, that our patience is exhausted, when modern publications are palmed upon the world with every external advantage and decoration, while the prior works, in which the whole substance is to be found, are neglected for the want of them; when we see men, whom we could name, making to themselves a kind of popular reputation by plundering the living; or when we too often find that the boasted march towards a supposed perfectibility in knowledge is, after all, but a faint echo of the footsteps of the illustrious dead.

It may be bad logic to reason from a fraction to the whole; it may be bad taste to raise the stale cry, *ex uno disce omnes*; but we deliberately repeat, that in other cases besides the case of Mr. Crichton, we could bring forward premises which would lead of necessity to an equally uncomfortable conclusion.

The length of the preceding observations, which have run on to

a much greater extent, and branched out into many more ramifications, than we intended, will oblige us to curtail our notice of that general and mighty subject which we wished to have set before our readers, namely, a comparative view of Christianity and Mohammedanism in their past and present state. Let us hope, that this inquiry—one of the most serious and important which can possibly occupy the human mind—will soon be taken up by some writer competent to do it justice; as justice has *not* been done by any of the late delineations, Mr. Crichton's being included in the number; and the older dissertations, we are free to confess, are partial in their tone, and most imperfect in their information. For ourselves, we can do little more than suggest the heads which such an inquiry should embrace: we mean the nature and character of the two religions abstractedly considered—the evidence on which they rest—the results which they have produced, and the influence which they are now exerting upon the human race—the probable fate which appears respectively reserved for them in the womb of time and amidst the progressive changes of society. If the investigation were temperately but worthily pursued, we would leave the decision of its merits almost without a scruple to the verdict of those self-styled philosophers themselves, who look upon both creeds with an equal eye of arrogant incredulity. Yet we are not ignorant that the system most favoured by these deep and liberal thinkers is, that Christianity and Mohammedanism are both false but both useful, just for the present, in their respective divisions of the earth, as preparatory dispensations, which may open the way hereafter for an universal and rational Deism; in short, that as yet religion, like gold in its virgin and unadulterated state, is too fine and too pure a thing for general purposes; and that the one must be mixed with a due proportion of errors and superstitions, before it can be fitted to have a pervading influence upon the public, as the other must be hardened by a due alloy of baser metal, before it can pass current as the coin of the realm. As the time, therefore, for the abolition of Christianity does not appear to have arrived, or even to be definitively fixed, we shall take advantage of the brief respite so graciously allowed us to express our confidence that as the case rests between Christianity and Mohammedanism,—the only positive religion which has obscured the triumphs of the Gospel for a moment,—a candid reasoner cannot fail to perceive that the contrast is as strong as between light and darkness, and that any effort or pretence to mix them up together as similar institutions, or pronounce upon them in the same terms, must be a proof either of the grossest ignorance, or the most malignant misrepresentation.

1. If he looks to the nature of the two religions, the veriest infidel must see that the one is of a high, and holy, and unearthly character, too much sublimed, he may perhaps think, from the common feelings and wishes of mankind; too meek, too passive, too unworldly, for the struggles and collisions of life; but still of a transcendent purity and beauty, and fresh with the everlasting hues of moral loveliness: he must see that the other is, in many and momentous parts, nothing but a coarse and clumsy imitation of Christianity; that it would have had no existence at all, if Christianity had not previously existed; that it gained its strongest hold by taking advantage of one point, upon which apparent abuses at least had crept into the Christian church, namely, the Unity of God; that all which it possesses of attractiveness and truth is borrowed from the faith which it would supplant; and that all which it can boast of originality or novelty belonging to itself is poor, and sensual, and low, vulgar in its conception, and debasing in its effects. He must see that the one is a jealous and exclusive religion, which, while it admits neither of partnership nor compromise, makes its way against the full stream of man's natural appetites and carnal desires; but that the other is framed, as it were, mainly "*ad captandum*;" and, as its first aim was to *adapt* and thus *add* itself to former creeds, to propitiate Jewish and even Christian prepossessions, so it still seeks to find friends in the strongest passions and propensities, the common weaknesses and distempers, of humanity.

Reason, therefore, would already suggest to us, even if we went no farther, that the one of those religions *might* well be of divine, while the other bore incontestable marks that it was of human, origin.

Indeed, if we advert to those antecedent and immutable tests which must always separate true religion from false, we find them all present in Christianity, and absent from Mohammedanism. The tests to which we allude are, that a religion should be *universal*, or capable of *universality* in its adaptation;—that, as based upon the everlasting principles of human nature, it should be applicable to all mankind, in all countries, and all times; therefore that it should be at once *permanent* and *progressive*,—at once *strict* and *accommodative*; and therefore again, that it should be *all-sufficient* in its own sphere, and thoroughly accomplish its own majestic and beneficent design, without interfering with the proper researches and advancements of human science, or fixing an incumbent weight upon the elasticity and energy of the human intellect; but, most of all, that it should be calculated to draw forth the perfection of the human character, and therefore addressed to the highest parts and principles of human nature.

What a contrast is presented by the two religions in every one of these respects. Mohammedanism is partial in its whole essence : it has not the germ of a possible universality within it ; and therefore cannot spring from that Supreme Being, who is equally the God and Father of all. Its founder knew nothing, thought of nothing, made provision for nothing, beyond the regions which had been familiar to his infancy. It is fitted only for a hot and oriental climate ; and near the poles its ablutions would be injurious, and its prayers would be physically impossible. Christianity, although originating in a country, where the heat and cold are similar, and with a being, who had certainly not larger opportunities of human information than the Arabian impostor, yet lays its prospective grasp upon the whole race of mankind. Christianity is not a matter of *localities*: it does not make religion a thing of climate, variable with the variations of the thermometer, only able to live, like certain animals, or grow, like certain plants, in peculiar degrees of latitude and longitude. The Icelander and the Negro, the inhabitant of the Eastern hemisphere or the Western, yes, every native of Europe, or Asia, or Africa, or America, is alike capable of being blest by its assurances, and may alike discover in his heart an echo to its doctrines. Mohammedanism has perhaps been misunderstood and traduced as to those portions of its creed which relate to the condition of women, and the character of the female soul ; but no rational being can examine the Mohammedan tenets, or contemplate the description of the Mohammedan paradise, without being convinced that it is a faith more fitted for *one* sex than for the other. Christianity, we need not say, offers present and future happiness equally to both ; and therefore we might well smile, if religious delusion were not a thing too serious for smiles, at the followers of Johanna Southcote, when they talk about the necessity of a *female* saviour ; and well may we nauseate the pestilent and loathsome rubbish about the "*emancipation of women*," which the apostles of Simonianism are now labouring to introduce.

Nor can Mohammedanism be either permanent or progressive more than it is universal. Christianity is truly progressive in a certain sense, for it is progressive even in its evidences ; it is capable of infinite progression from the plastic and expansive power, by which it accommodates itself to every combination of circumstances, to every state and stage of human society ; and yet it secures its permanent identity by the inflexible holiness of its doctrines, the immutable character of its author and its laws. Christianity is equally wise in its ordinances and in its omissions. Mohammedanism does at once too little and too much. It does

too little, by stopping short of any original attempt to explain God's moral and spiritual government, or man's inherent imperfections and contrarieties: it does too much, by assuming a direct interference with matters of civil policy or physical science; by placing an iron barrier in the way of legislative or scientific advancement, by fixing a chain across the harbour, when men would either embark and go forth in quest of human knowledge, or come home laden with its fruits.

The more narrowly, then, we inspect the two schemes of belief, the more clearly do we find, that Mohammed was, after all, little more than an acute barbarian; an enthusiast, advanced in skill and knowledge far beyond the average of his Arab contemporaries; but utterly deficient, when tried by any ideal standard of wisdom or virtue: and, in the same proportion, and by the same close scrutiny, do we discover more and more the very perfection of *abstract* prudence and excellence in all the institutions of Jesus Christ. The faith of Islam wears the stamp of imposture upon its brow: for it has not only no *foresight*, but no *philosophy*. Instead of bringing out the highest feelings, and penetrating into the inmost recesses of man's nature, it has positively no acquaintance with them. It offers no solution of the great enigma of existence: it affords no key to man's moral and spiritual position: it has absolutely no conception, beyond what it has appropriated from the Bible, of the vast mysteries and profound abysses of man's constitution and destiny. Christianity, on the other hand, if we may so speak, applies to them the most wondrous, and searching, and accurate *metaphysics*. Christianity, without the slightest pretension to system, or systematic arrangement—without one technical expression, or one scholastic term, dives into the farthest depths of our universal being; and explains its anomalies, and reconciles its contradictions, and threads the labyrinth of its errors and vices; and not only reveals God to man, but reveals man to himself.

But the objection may be started, if Mohammed was so ignorant, and his scheme has so little foundation in a capacious knowledge of human nature, how are we to account for his wide and rapid success? This apparent stumbling-block, however, arises from a misapprehension of the real question at issue. No one denies to Mohammed a very considerable measure of acquaintance with the *prominent* and *obvious* lineaments of human nature. But this, we confidently state, is a common-place, and shallow, and superficial, and worldly thing. Nay, we go farther, and affirm, that his success was wide and rapid, *because* his knowledge of man was, in this sense, common-place, and shallow, and superficial, and worldly: *because* he touched the springs, which lie upon the

surface; *because* he worked upon those feelings and tendencies, which are merely the *proximate* causes of human action: and so appealed to the pride and sensuality of the Arabians, just as Napoleon appealed to the ambition and vain-glory of the French. But a man must be miserably dark as to his own state, and can never have consulted the inward oracles of his own spirit, unless he has learnt that something is required altogether distinct from this worldly cleverness: something which immeasurably transcends it both in kind and degree: and that no form of religion can be a true religion, unless it holds out a lamp to illuminate the hidden chambers of the understanding and the heart, and burn on with a steady and increasing lustre even amidst the denseness and the foulness of that moral atmosphere.

Of true, internal evidence, then, Mohammedanism has nothing, and Christianity has every thing. For really we cannot admit into the computation the alleged beauties of style manifested by the Koran. If the Koran were as sublime as the sublimest prophecies of Isaiah, and as noble as the noblest passages of St. Paul, we should still dispute the validity of the argument, when grounded upon the *style*, as distinct from the matter of a revelation. To say nothing of the vast untravelled distance between the Bible and the Koran, when seen together by the equal light of a literal translation, we protest against the naked absurdity of resting the divine origin of a religion upon the graces of composition alone. We might as well attempt to prove the truth of Paganism from the beauties of the Iliad: and assert that Jupiter is God, and Homer is his Prophet, because the poem is so fine, that it could only have been written or dictated by Jupiter.

Into the *experimental* evidence in either case, or the practical influence of the two faiths, as displayed by their respective believers, we shall have a fuller insight, when we come to the historical results. Yet it is no breach of candour to say, that between Mohammedanism and Christianity a comparison can hardly be made, whether in public or private affairs; whether upon the broadest or the narrowest scale. We firmly believe, however, that a good Moslem is likely to be a much better man, and a much better citizen, than a philosophical infidel among the Moslems. Of the two evils—and how strong an argument is this for missionary zeal and ardour in the propagation of Christianity—the evil of a false and superstitious faith is less than the evil of a callous and earthly-minded scepticism. For we firmly believe that the emptiest and most corrupt religion, inasmuch as it partakes of the common nature of all religion, has more truth in its theory, and produces consequences less deplorable from its actual efficacy, than the total absence and negation of religion. The



worst religion, we repeat, is not so bad as none; and even from Mohammedanism a man may learn the rudimental notions of a future responsibility—and justice—and charity—and prayer and reverence to God—and truth—and some kind of temperance and controul over his passions: while from utter irreligion he can learn nothing but hardness of heart, and debasement of intellect, and ungovernable selfishness of will. Still we shall not inflict upon the Gospel the grievous wrong of speaking of its experimental evidence in the same breath with the species of experimental evidence, which would show Mohammedanism to be less baneful than Atheism.

As to the direct *external* evidence deducible from miracles and prophecies in the respective cases of the two religions, the contrast is even more extraordinary. Upon the Christian prophecies and miracles, it would be at best superfluous to expatiate. Let us only take the occasion to say, that in Mr. Crichton's book there are many corroborative testimonies how exactly and how literally the Scriptural predictions, which bear upon Arabia and the Arabs, either have been accomplished, or are in the course of accomplishment.

The evidence from *prophecies*, on which *Mohammedanism* would attempt to rest, we shall quote, as it is given in an excellent work, recently published by the Rev. James Carlile, entitled "Letters on the Divine Origin and Authority of the Holy Scriptures."

"Mohammed offered his religion as a continuation or completion of the Jewish and the Christian. He admitted the divine inspiration of Moses and the prophets, and also of Jesus and his apostles, although he charged the Jews and Christians of his day with having corrupted their respective sacred books. To connect his religion with that of Scripture, he searched the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments for passages that he might represent as being prophetic of himself; and the following are the chief of those that have been selected by him and his followers.

"Deut. xxxiii. 2.—'The Lord came from Sinai, and rose up from Seir unto them; he shined forth from mount Paran, and he came with ten thousand of saints: from his right hand went a fiery law for them.' In this passage, the Moslem writers say, is meant the coming down of the law to Moses on mount Sinai, of the Gospel to Jesus at Jerusalem, and of the Koran to Mohammed at Mecca. For, say they, Seir signifies the mountains of Jerusalem, where Jesus appeared; and Paran the mountains of Mecca, where Mohammed appeared. Here, however, their ignorance of geography betrays them. The mount Seir of Scripture is not in Palestine, but in Edom, now part of Arabia, and called Djebel Sheera till this day; and mount Paran, or Pharan, is above five hundred miles distant from Mecca.



“ Ps. l. 2.—‘ Out of Zion, the perfection of beauty, God hath shined.’ The Syriac version reads this passage thus: ‘ Out of Zion God hath showed a glorious crown;’ and the Arabic version, which was translated from the Syriac, and with which alone Mohammed was acquainted, expresses the two last words by *Eclinan Mahmudan*, i. e. an honourable crown. And the word *Mahmudan* being somewhat like Mohammed, they read the verse thus: ‘ Out of Zion God hath showed Mohammed’s crown.’ This is founded on mistranslation at second hand: and, besides, it foretels no event that has actually occurred, for God has never showed Mahommed’s crown out of Zion.

“ Is. xxi. 7.—‘ And he saw a chariot, with a couple of horsemen, a chariot of asses, and a chariot of camels.’ This passage, the old Latin version reads: ‘ And he saw a chariot of two horsemen, a rider upon an ass, and a rider upon a camel.’ By the rider upon the ass the Moslem writers understand Jesus Christ, because he rode into Jerusalem upon an ass; and by the rider on the camel, they understand Mohammed, because he was an Arab, and the Arabs are accustomed to ride on camels. This needs no refutation.

“ John xvi. 7.—Our Saviour tells his disciples, ‘ If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you.’ By the Comforter, they would have us to understand Mohammed, whom they, therefore, call the ‘ Paraclete,’ which is the Greek word rendered ‘ Comforter’ in our version. This also is a mistranslation in the Arabic version, in consequence of the translators mistaking the Greek word, rendered comforter, for another Greek word somewhat like it, the meaning of which is ‘ Illustrious.’ For they say, that the meaning of Mohammed’s name is ‘ Illustrious.’ Our Lord, however, himself explains whom he meant, when he adds, ‘ even the Spirit of truth;’ and then tells the disciples that the Spirit would come to them at Jerusalem, ‘ not many days hence;’ which promise was accordingly fulfilled in the descent of the Holy Ghost at the day of Pentecost.

“ In addition to these passages, the Koran asserts, that Jesus foretold the coming of Mohammed in the following words: ‘ O! children of Israel, verily I am the Apostle of God, sent unto you, confirming the law which was delivered before me, and bringing good tidings of an Apostle who shall come after me, and whose name shall be *AHMED*.’ This was an argument addressed to the ignorance of his followers, as no such passage exists in the Gospels. He indeed complains frequently that both Jews and Christians suppressed passages, both in the Old and New Testament, which foretold his coming. This, however, was an evidence of his own ignorance; for the copies of the Scriptures were, long before his days, so widely scattered abroad, in so many languages, that it was impossible either to mutilate or to interpolate them, without incurring the certainty of detection; and, if ever there were such passages, Mohammed could have had no difficulty in adducing them to the satisfaction, or, at least, to the silencing of his enemies.”—*Carlile*, pp. 239—240.

As to the *Mohammedan miracles*, Mr. Crichton’s account is graphic and curious enough, and we are glad to cite it as a fa-

vousable specimen of the work, the more particularly as it only pretends to be an abridgment of Gagnier.

“ Religion, whether true or false, has usually appealed to the confirmation of miracles. These credentials the Impostor himself admitted to be authentic. According to his own doctrine, therefore, the unbelieving Arabs might demand, and they did repeatedly urge him to produce, similar evidence of his mission. Sensible of his weakness, he evaded the force of their objections; appealing to the inimitable composition of the Koran as the greatest of all miracles, and protecting himself by the obscure boast of vision and prophecy.

“ His votaries, however, were neither so modest nor so ingenuous. Of his miraculous gifts they were more confident than he was himself; and much learning has been expended, and innumerable volumes written, to convince the world that his miracles were more numerous than those of all the inspired teachers who had gone before him.

“ The first of these signal performances was the Miracle of the Splitting, alluding to his cleaving the orb of the moon in twain. The Koreish, wishing to confound him before the eyes of his fellow-citizens, had challenged him to verify his claims by bringing that luminary from heaven in presence of the whole assembly. Mohammed accepted the proposal with confidence. At his command the sky was darkened at noon; when the obedient planet, though but five days old, appeared full-orbed, leapt from the firmament, and, bounding through the air, alighted on the summit of the Kaaba, which it encircled by seven distinct revolutions. Turning to the Prophet it did him reverence, addressed him in very elegant Arabic, and pronounced a discourse in his praise, concluding with a formula of the Moslem creed. These salutations finished, it entered the right sleeve of his mantle, and made its exit by the left. Then descending from the collar of his robe to the fringe, it mounted into the air, separating into two halves. In this manner it resumed its station in the sky, the parts gradually uniting in one round and luminous orb as before. Such is the substance of a ridiculous fiction invented by the biographers of Mohammed, who have coloured it with more extravagance and minuteness of detail than we have ventured to narrate.

“ The next legendary adventure of the Prophet is yet more extraordinary,—the *Mesra*, or famous Nocturnal Journey to heaven; of which the Eastern writers, in the wild delirium of their fancy, have given the most laboured and grotesque descriptions. With sublime touches of imagination, that would have done honour to the muse of Milton or Dante, they have mixed a legion of idle phantoms and puerile wonders too shocking and extravagant even for the credulity of childhood.

“ On the night of this celestial excursion, calm but exceedingly dark, Mohammed represents himself as asleep between the hills of Safa and Meroua, when Gabriel approached and awoke him. Having apprised the Prophet of his intended voyage, he presented him with the animal called Borak, a sort of nondescript, larger than an ass, but smaller than a mule, with a human face and the body of a horse. His colour was

milkwhite ; the hair of his neck of fine pearls ; his ears emeralds, and his eyes two sparkling hyacinths. His whole body, wings, and tail, bristled with the finest jewellery.

“ In the twinkling of an eye they cleared the hills of Mecca, and were on the top of Sinai, where prayers were said, and where the print of the beast's hoof is still shown. In the same manner they performed their devotions at Jerusalem, where Mohammed received the salutations of the ancient prophets, and met with divers other adventures. Leaving Borak fastened to a ring at the gate of the Temple, the travellers ascended by a ladder of light, through an immense expanse of air, till they reached the first heaven, distant a journey of 500 years from the earth. It was composed of a subtile vapour, with a roof of fine silver, from which hung the stars by chains of massive gold. They entered by a prodigious gate, which, on the name of Mohammed being announced, was opened by the porter. The first person with whom he exchanged salutations was Adam, who appeared in the form of a decrepit old man, and hailed him as the greatest and best of his posterity. The whole firmament swarmed with angels, all busy in their several occupations, some watering the clouds, others chanting hymns. They appeared in all manner of shapes,—men, beasts, and birds ; for each assumed the likeness of those terrestrial creatures intrusted to their spiritual guardianship. The most conspicuous of these was the angel or representative of the cock, white as snow, and of such gigantic stature that his head touched the second heaven, (a distance of 500 years' travel,) or, as others affirm, reached through all the seven heavens. He assisted in the matin songs of the angelic choirs, and gave the signal for all his species to crow, whether material or immaterial.

“ The second heaven was of pure gold, and contained twice as many angels as the first. Here Mohammed was saluted by Noah, who commended himself to his prayers ; but he was not permitted to take further notice of the various marvels he saw. The third heaven was made of precious stones, and more populous than the second. Here the travellers were greeted by David and Solomon, and saw a huge angel, called the Faithful of God, who had 100,000 others under his command. In the fourth heaven, which was of emerald, they received the felicitations of Enoch and Joseph. Here they beheld an angel of a very stern and terrible aspect, the distance between whose eyes was equal to 70,000 days' journey, according to the rate of Arabian travelling ; and such was his capacity, that he could have swallowed the seven heavens and seven earths as easily as a pea. Before him was a large table, on which he was continually writing, inserting the names of all that were born, computing the days of their lives, and blotting them out from his register the moment their allotted portion of years expired. It was Azrael, the angel of death, whose emissaries traverse the earth perpetually, keeping watch over the issues of human life. No smile ever lighted up his dismal visage, his business being to weep and make lamentations for the sins of men.

“ Into the fifth heaven, which was composed of adamant, they were admitted by a gate of pure silver, inscribed with the Mohammedan

creed. Aaron congratulated them on their arrival. This sphere was the great storehouse of God's wrath :—a black and horrid pit vomiting forth a thick smoke, the stench of which was insupportable. The presiding angel of this infernal treasury was hideously deformed, his withering look being enough to blast the material universe. His eyes were of rolling flame; his face like copperas, disfigured with wens and excrescences; and around him lay darts and chains of fire, the terrible instruments of Divine vengeance, which were kept in constant preparation for rebellious sinners, especially for the unbelieving Arabs. Quitting these dreary mansions they advanced to the sixth heaven, which was of carbuncle. At some distance they perceived an aged man, with shaggy hair, clothed in a woollen garment, and leaning on a staff. It was Moses, who saluted his brother Prophet, but immediately burst into tears at the thought that this 'Arabian boy' would be instrumental in bringing more of the race of Ishmael into paradise than he and all the prophets had done of the Jewish nation. Here they met with a new prodigy in pneumatology,—an angel, one half of whose body was snow and the other fire, yet these discordant elements were neither melted nor extinguished.

"But the most marvellous of all created beings was the tutelar angel of the seventh heaven. He had 70,000 heads, each head 70,000 faces, each face as many mouths, each mouth as many tongues, and each tongue spoke seventy thousand different languages, all of which were employed incessantly in praise and adoration. This last and highest of the celestial spheres was made of divine light. Here was the abode of Abraham, and, according to some, of Jesus Christ, who is alleged to have treated Mohammed with the same respect as the other prophets.

"Having penetrated to the lotus-tree, (Al Sedra,) which is the utmost limit of created knowledge, the boundary of these delicious regions, beyond which no angel dares to pass, Gabriel took leave of his fellow-traveller, commending him to the protection of superior spirits during the remainder of his journey. Continuing his march through ranks of glorified cherubim, and crossing two seas, one of light and one of darkness, the solitary Prophet passed the 70,000 veils of separation, each being a journey of 500 years in thickness, and the same in distance between them. They were composed, some of darkness, others of fire, snow, water, ether, and chaos. Finally, he pierced the veils of Beauty, of Perfection, of Omnipotence, of Singularity, of Immensity, and of Unity. When the last of these was raised, 70,000 spirits were seen prostrate before the throne, which was surrounded by a light of the most dazzling brightness. A voice commanded him to draw near; on which he advanced till within two cubits, or bows' length, of the Divine presence. As a mark of his favour, the Almighty, we are informed, laid his hand on the Prophet's shoulder, when a feeling of intense cold thrilled to the marrow over his whole frame, but was immediately superseded by a sensation of inexpressible sweetness. This was followed, as he pretended, by a long and familiar intercourse with the Supreme Being, who revealed to him many hidden mysteries, instructed him in the knowledge of his law, and conferred on him several extraor-

dinary privileges. The last of his instructions was the command of fifty daily prayers, afterwards reduced by the advice of Moses to five, enjoined on all Mussulmans.

“ Bidding adieu to these glorious regions, Mohammed rejoined his conductor Gabriel, whom he found by the lotus-tree. The travellers now bent their course towards the earth, receiving every where, as they passed, the compliments and benedictions of angels, who flocked in crowds to salute them. At Jerusalem they found Borak in the exact position they had left him, and in less than a second they arrived at Mecca, the slumbering inhabitants being quite unconscious of the transactions of that marvellous expedition ; for the whole journey, a labour of many thousand years, was performed in the tenth part of a night. Such is the celebrated *History of the Ascension*, as Abu Horaira calls it; whose minute and circumstantial narrative we have abridged from Gagnier.”—*Crichton*, vol. i. pp. 239—246.

And this is all that can be opposed to those innumerable predictions, and those stupendous miracles, on which Christianity is built, as on a rock !

We have now only to turn our eyes for a moment to the *results* of the two systems ; but here we can add nothing to the overwhelming testimony of the widest and most conspicuous facts. “ *Si quæris, circumspice.*” We point to the different aspects of the Mohammedan and Christian portions of the globe. On the one side we see man, from generation to generation, almost become stationary, like the inferior animals. We see him bound by a depressing thralldom, which he can never break without breaking the whole fabric of his faith. We see him groaning under the leaden sceptre of a religion as unwise as it is unspiritual ; as fatal to the moral and intellectual progress of the human race, as it is ignorant of the true economy and providence of God. On the other side, we see the blessed influences of a creed which loves to take philosophy and science as its handmaids,—which leaves to reason its proper prerogative, and to the natural activities of man their proper direction and their legitimate sphere. This Mohammedanism has not dared to do, and therefore it will surely perish ; and every form of Christianity, as far as its *distinctive* character is concerned, will perish too, whether it be Popery, or any modern scheme of evangelical Protestantism, which will not venture to submit itself to the fair scrutiny of the understanding ; but would fix a gulf between religion and reason, between human knowledge and divine. We cannot stop to qualify this assertion, for it is a digression in itself ; but we discern some growing symptoms in the popular theology of the day which have constrained us to make it, even at the risk of some misrepresentation and reproach. Real Christianity blends—we will not talk of rationalism—but the purest

*reasonableness* with the highest godliness. Real Christianity, if we may so speak, intellectualizes as it spiritualizes the world; and not merely every country, but every parish, and district, and hamlet, where it visibly exists, smiles with the healthy countenance of human industry, and glows with the ardent tread of human advancement, as it teems with thrilling devotion to a Creator and a Saviour.

The actual consequences, then, of the two religions are just such as their nature might have led us to expect; and also as to their present attitude and future doom, our *a priori* speculations are fully verified by historical and statistical records, which it is impossible to dispute. Mohammedanism, as we might well have supposed, has had its brief and stormy career of blood-stained brilliancy; but its crescent wanes, and its sun is going down.—The glory of its empire has departed for ever. At first, a religious fanaticism was the parent of an astonishing success, in the same way (although to an extent far more prodigious) as a military and political fanaticism led the republican armies from victory to victory in the early periods of the French revolution. Mohammedanism burst forth indeed with an outbreak of triumphant splendour; but it is not improbable that, in proportion to the whole duration of earth, its conquests will have lasted little more time, and made little more of eventual impression, than the spread of the Wahabees, in proportion to the whole existence of Mohammedanism itself. Mohammedanism has come with a violent and sudden occupancy: Christianity comes with a moral and spiritual colonization. The true engines of the one faith are war and the sword; the true engines of the other are peace and missions. Mohammedanism has been like the irruption of a torrent, for an instant bearing down every thing before it with a destructive velocity, advancing and then receding with the traces, not of fertilization, but of ravage. Christianity is rather as a gradual tillage, making its beautiful incroachments more and more upon the fetid marsh and the tangled forest, causing the surface to bloom with abundance, and the bosom of the soil to bring forth a continual increase of inestimable fruits. For history, we repeat, affords the amplest confirmation of these remarks, both as to the faith of Islam, and as to the faith of the Gospel. History best tells us, both with how appalling a swiftness the star of Mohammed rose into the ascendant, and with how complete a certainty it is now sinking into an irrecoverable eclipse: and it would be injustice to Mr. Crichton not to allow that he has vividly depicted the rise of that colossal but short-lived greatness,—that vast but uncemented edifice, not merely of military domination, but literary and scientific renown;—and also,



that in *this* chapter, at p. 450, he has the grace to speak of the "*rapid and glowing narrative of Gibbon.*"

"A victorious line of march had been prolonged above 1000 miles, from the Rock of Gibraltar to the banks of the Loire. The repetition of an equal space would have carried the Saracens to the confines of Poland and the Highlands of Scotland. The Rhine is not more impassable than the Nile or the Euphrates, and the Arabian fleet might have sailed without a naval combat into the mouth of the Thames. The seven Saxon kingdoms of Britain, torn by wars and factions, must have presented but a feeble barrier to the Eastern invaders, whose hardy frames seemed equally adapted to all climes and all countries. The Heptarchy, which the victorious arms and judicious policy of Egbert had united, might have passed into the hands of a viceroy from the court of Bagdad. Perhaps the interpretation of the Koran might have become the scholastic divinity of the halls of Oxford and Edinburgh. Our cathedrals might have been supplanted by the gorgeous mosque, and our pulpits employed in demonstrating to a circumcised people the truth of the apostleship and revelations of Mohammed. Such was the destiny that seemed to impend over all Europe, from the Baltic to the Cyclades, when the standard of Islam floated over the walls of Tours."—p. 451.

"When the Arabs first tried their valour at Muta against a foreign enemy, they could scarcely have anticipated that, before the close of a century, their empire should have exceeded in extent the greatest monarchies of ancient times, or that the successors of their Prophet should have risen to be the most powerful and absolute sovereigns on earth. Yet such was the fact. Their caliphs exercised a most unlimited and undefined prerogative, unfettered by popular rights, the votes of a senate, or the laws of a free constitution. They united in their own person the regal and sacerdotal characters; and if the Koran was the rule of their actions, they were the supreme judges and interpreters of that divine book. They reigned by the right of conquest over nations to whom the name of liberty was unknown, and who had not yet learned to detest those acts of violence and severity that were exercised at their expense. Under the last of the Omniades, the Saracen empire extended 200 days' journey from east to west; and though the long and narrow province of Africa, the sleeve of the robe, as their writers style it, were withdrawn, the solid and compact dominion within the Jaxartes, the Hellespont, and the Indus, would spread on every side to the measure of five months of the march of a caravan in length, and four in breadth. From this estimate an important fragment was soon detached by the revolt of Spain; but its loss was more than counterbalanced by the subsequent conquests in India, Tartary, and European Turkey. This vast empire was ruled by a wretched political system, in which we seek in vain for the union and discipline that pervaded the government of Augustus and the Antonines. The only national feature was that general resemblance of manners and opinions which the progress of Islam had diffused over this immense space. The language and laws of the Koran were studied with equal devotion at



Samarcand and Seville; the Moor and the Indian embraced as countrymen and brothers in the Temple of Mecca; and the Arabian language was adopted as the popular idiom in all the provinces to the westward of the Tigris."—pp. 463, 464.

The following observations, taken from the Introduction, are also striking, and in some degree just.

"Short as was the career of the military pageant, which achieved such vast and extraordinary changes in the moral and political state of a large portion of the world, it is replete with events interesting to the statesman and the philosopher; unfolding a series of characters and incidents that will both engage and reward our curiosity. The victories, revolutions, and capricious vicissitudes of human fortune that pass by in rapid succession, are without example in any nation of ancient or modern Europe. The catalogue of the leading personages, the caliphs and conquerors that figured on this remarkable theatre, presents some strange contrasts to the ordinary history of successful adventurers, and the distribution of earthly grandeur. Among other nations, heroes and legislators generally require a process of training; and it is only by slow and persevering degrees that the usurper ascends the pinnacle of his ambition. Here we have the rare spectacle of slaves mounted on thrones; lawless bandits becoming the dispensers of justice and protection; illiterate shepherds and merchants suddenly transformed into the commanders of armies, or vested with the solemn functions of kings and pontiffs. Yet, singular as it may appear, not a few of them were distinguished for civil and military talents; others have gained a lasting celebrity by their patronage and love of science; and some of them shed a lustre on the diadem by the exercise of those peaceful and princely virtues which have procured for the rulers of other countries the venerable title of Fathers of their people.

"It was in the courts of Bagdad and Cufa, of Damascus and Cordova, that learning found a hospitable asylum, when a succession of barbarous inroads had nearly quenched the last rays of Greek and Roman literature, and scarcely left a single monument of art or genius in Europe. Nothing, except their own victories, is more surprising than the progress which this acute and ingenious people made in the cultivation of every department of human knowledge. From a state of ignorance and barbarism, in which they had been plunged for centuries, they emerged with a lustre not more remarkable for its brilliancy than for the gigantic height to which it rose. Nor can we account, except from the strength and versatility of their mental capacities, for this sudden blaze of genius which burst forth in every corner of their empire, and spread its influence as far as their arms extended. Many of the caliphs were protectors of learning. They lived surrounded with poets and orators, and assembled in their palaces men of the most distinguished acquirements from every quarter of the world. The name of Haroun-al-Raschid, the hero of the Thousand-and-one Nights, stands associated with those enchanting fictions which have made Bagdad a fairy-land, and will continue to diffuse a charm until taste and imagination shall become extinct.

“ Under his successors, learning of all kinds was cultivated and propagated with equal zeal. In every town, from the banks of the Tigris to the Atlantic, schools and colleges were established. The sun of science and philosophy diffused its humanizing influence over the fierce spirits and savage manners of Africa. A chain of academies stretched along the whole Mediterranean shore ; and in the cities of Cairo, Fez, and Morocco, the most magnificent buildings were appropriated to public instruction.

“ Spain was one of the most celebrated seats of Arabian learning. A vast number of eminent names in poetry, medicine, mathematics, and every department of study, adorned its annals even in the dreary night of the twelfth century. In its schools and libraries the sacred fires of Oriental knowledge continued to burn with more than their ancient splendour, when the rest of the world was sunk in Gothic ignorance.”—pp. 23—25.

How strange, indeed, and how awful appears to us even now the spectre and the phantom—for a spectre and a phantom it has become—of the Mohammedan power! Asia and Africa overrun—all Europe threatened—Spain occupied—and the Mohammedan general only defeated in the *centre of France* by what—if we were not believers in the superintending and ever-present interposition of God, which says to all error and all evil, “ Thus far, and no farther”—we should be inclined to call the fortunate combination of bravery and prudence in one individual, Charles Martel:—the halo of literature, and science, and art, and public splendour, and social refinement, encircling the Moslem creed; and, on the other side, the arms of Christendom baffled, the policy of Christendom overthrown, her potentates divided among themselves, and hating each other with a deadly hatred: her knowledge sunk and lost: her very religion disfigured by superstitions, debased by corruptions, weakened by the wretched disputes between the Greek and Latin Churches;—such was the spectacle presented; and surely it was enough to inspire the follower of Mohammed with a vaunting exultation, and almost fill the disciple of Jesus with a quailing despair.

And yet, at that very period, there was in the one faith a principle of indestructible vitality and perpetual growth; in the other, there was the seed of decay, and the element of dissolution. At that very period, the enormous fabric of Mohammedanism was like a pyramid placed upon its apex, ready to fall and crumble to pieces, not so much by its unwieldy weight, as by its false position. Its military successes declined; because fanaticism is a vehement flame, but not an abiding heat. Its literature and science dwindled away; because they had depended solely upon the personal character of successive caliphs, but were, in fact, rather repugnant than congenial to the system itself. The rottenness of the core soon began to show itself upon the surface;

and at this day all the members have the outward appearance of being sickly and unsound. In the meanwhile the leaven of faith worked in secret throughout the mass of Christendom. And although, in too many regions of Europe, Christianity is still corrupted, still disfigured, still debased; although in not one single region of Europe it is exerting a hundredth part of the influence which it might exert, and we trust is destined to exert, it is now working with an energy which gives us good hope that it will in time leaven the whole lump. It is securing old conquests and achieving new. It loses ground nowhere, it gains ground everywhere. There is no sea so remote, no shore so inhospitable, no tribe so savage, no climate so rude, but that it is visited, or will soon be visited, by men who bear the glad tidings of the Gospel: art, science, civilization, improvement, the decencies, and charities, and amenities, and even elegancies of life; the best charm of polished manners, the best sweets of domestic intercourse—all are in its train. The immediate good which Christianity is effecting for the human species would seem a thing of gigantic magnitude, if it were not lost in the future good which it may effect for every individual: and the temporal benefits which it diffuses in its path would seem of inestimable price, if they were not overshadowed and absorbed in its spiritual blessings.

How sublime, then, and how encouraging, and how consolatory, is the prospect. Were time and space allowed us, we might trace the finger of Providence making use of agents and instruments the most diversified and the most marvellous, turning to the fulfilment of its gracious designs the caprices of nations and the appetites of men. We might trace in the very ambition of Russia as it menaces Turkey with destruction or dismemberment, and in the occupation of Algiers and the surrounding territory by the French, and in the complete predominance of the British power in India, and in the very thirst for change and innovation by which the present sultan is distinguished, and the very love of European arts, and discipline, and usages, which his great rival, the viceroy of Egypt, has evinced, intelligible and unambiguous signs of the downfall of Mohammedanism, and the eventual rise of Christianity upon its ruins. Clouds and darkness may brood for the moment over our Church at home; but we may almost lose sight of them in contemplating the glories of our religion by degrees spreading and shining to their perfect day. When the whole theatre of earth is taken into one view, we have glimpses of the radiant truth, that “all things are working together for good;” all things conspiring to the triumphs of Christianity, until it shall become the universal religion of the human race!

Here we ought to stop; for we feel that we cannot revert to any other subject without a *bathos* of illimitable descent. But,

nevertheless, a sense of justice urges us to refer for an instant to a production, which has called forth from us expressions of some harshness and severity. Let us conclude, then, by saying, that Mr. Crichton's volumes, if we look at them by themselves, and could forget the preceding works out of which they have been compiled, would form a really interesting and really valuable publication; and, like all the other volumes of the Edinburgh Cabinet Library, they are beautifully printed, very neatly bound, and embellished with engravings of considerable merit.

---

**ART. VI.—1.** *The Book of Jasher, with Testimonies and Notes, Critical and Historical, explanatory of the Text; to which is prefixed Various Readings, and a Preliminary Dissertation, proving the authenticity of the Work.* Translated into English from the Hebrew, by Flaccus Albinus Alcuinus, of Britain, Abbot of Canterbury, who went a Pilgrimage into the Holy Land and Persia, where he discovered this Volume in the City of Gazna. Bristol: printed for the Editor, by Philip Rose, 20, Broadmead; sold by Longman, London; Richardson, Bristol; and by all other booksellers. 1829.

**2.** *Prospectus.—To be Published by Subscription, The Book of Jasher, with Testimonies and Notes, Critical and Historical, explanatory of the Text, to which is prefixed, Various Readings, and a Preliminary Dissertation, proving the authenticity of the work. Translated into Anglo-Saxon from the Hebrew.* By Flaccus Albinus Alcuinus, of Britain, Abbot of Canterbury, who went a Pilgrimage into the Holy Land and Persia, where he discovered this Volume, in the City of Gazna. *Revised, Corrected and Edited by the Rev. C. R. Bond, formerly of Em. Coll. Cambridge.* William Henry Cox, 55, Great Queen Street, Lincoln's Inn Fields.

**3.** *Bibliographical Notes on the Book of Jasher.* By Thomas Hartwell Horne, B. D. of St. John's College, Cambridge; Rector of the united Parishes of St. Edmund the King, and St. Nicholas Acons, Lombard Street;\* Prebendary of St. Paul's; Author of the "Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures." London, printed by A. Spottiswoode, New Street Square. 1833.

EXCEPTING in two scanty references, one afforded by the miraculous stoppage of the Sun upon Gideon and of the Moon

\* We most cordially rejoice at seeing these new appendages to the name of Mr. Hartwell Horne. No man of our times has been more diligent or more useful in Biblical researches; and none has more justly earned a reward which has been bestowed upon him in a manner not less honourable to the Patron than to the Preferred.

in the Valley of Ajalon, the other in a notice of an Ordinance of David, prefixed to his Lamentation over Saul and Jonathan, we hear nothing more in Scripture of the Book of Jasher. A wide field, therefore, has been opened for conjecture. Is Jasher (Jaser) a proper name? or are we to render the Hebrew word in its ordinary signification of *Just*? If the latter course be adopted, shall we call the Book the Book of the Just? or of the Just One? or of Justice? Is it to be considered a Chronicle of the Good and Wise? or a Work of authenticity and sincere faith? or a Legal Directory? Did it contain Annals, forming a kind of *Acta Publica* for the Jewish Commonwealth? Was it a portion of the writings which Josephus tells us were deposited in the Temple? or a *Spicilegium* of Psalms, Hymns, and Heroic Songs? Each of these explanations has been offered in turn; and, so far as we perceive, each is rested on an equally fanciful basis. Without sufficient data indeed whereon we may commence induction, hypothesis appears to be alike endless and fruitless.

But, if we give credit to the pretensions of the Volume the title of which stands first above, this obscure question is now fully resolved, and the Book of Jasher is not only distinctly ascertained to be the production of a Writer so named, but his very words have been discovered, and are here displayed.

“ The following translation of ‘The Book of Jasher,’ was discovered by a gentleman in a journey through the North of England, in 1721. It lay by him for several years, until, in 1750, there was a rumour of a new translation of the Bible, when he laid it before a noble Earl. On perusal, he highly approved of it, as a work of great sincerity, plainness, and truth. His lordship’s opinion was, that it should have been placed in the Bible, before the Book of Joshua.

“ He further adds, “ By a writing on the outside of the manuscript, it should seem that this translation was laid before our first reformers, because it says, ‘ I have read the Book of Jasher twice over, and I much approve of it, as a piece of great antiquity and curiosity; but I cannot assent that it should be made a part of the Canon of Scripture.

Signed, WICKLIFFE.’ ”

“ Since 1751, the manuscript has been preserved with great care by a gentleman who lived to a very advanced age, and died some time since. On the event of his death, a friend to whom he had presented it, gave it to the present Editor, who, conceiving that so valuable a piece of antiquity should not be lost to men of literature, and biblical students, has committed it to the press, not doubting but that the attention of the learned will be attracted to so singular a volume.

“ The Editor cannot assert any thing from his own knowledge, beyond Alcuin’s account, but *that* carries with it such an air of probability and truth, that he does not doubt its authenticity. Some account of this volume may be found in Alcuin’s works, published in one volume,

folio, in the year 1600, in Paris. He died in 804. Should any gentleman possess a transcript, or copy of it, the Editor will be greatly obliged by any communication made to him, through the medium of the Printer."

Every thing here, to adopt a pictorial phrase, is in admirable keeping. The principal figure, Jasher himself, as we have already seen, is somewhat visionary, and especial care therefore has been taken not to overwhelm him by the subsidiary grouping. The itinerant discoverer, the noble Earl, the gentleman who lived to a very advanced age and died sometime since, the friend to whom he presented the inestimable MS., nay, even the present Editor of it, each and all, "come like shadows, so depart." If we know nothing of Jasher, we know quite as little of his accompaniments; and we have no reason to borrow the complaint of the Sailor, when looking at Lord Nelson's Monument, that there was "too much Lion and too little Jack"! The relative proportions of each are very honestly preserved, and neither Jack nor Lion can be accused of ostentatious predominance.

Perhaps from the very lack of a name, (for a name in these matters imports much,) the Bristol Speculation of 1829 appears to have failed. Some of the copies then printed were brought into the London market, and disposed of at the price of ten shillings each; and subsequently a vagabond mendicant, assuming the character of a necessitous clergyman, very largely circulated the Prospectus to which we have given the second place at the head of this article. The Conditions of the publication were as follows:—

"1. This work shall be printed with beautiful type, on a fine wove paper; the size, Demy Quarto.

2. A list of subscribers shall be published, and the Copies delivered in the order in which they have been subscribed for.

3. The volume will be printed and delivered to the subscribers as soon as possible, being now in the Press.

4. *Noblemen and Gentlemen are respectfully requested to pay the subscription, £1., in advance.*"

We need not dwell upon the importance of the last of the above Conditions, (the Italics in which it is printed are our own,) but it is only just to add, that whenever the *Circulator* (it is indifferent whether this word be received in its English or in its Latin sense) observed any reluctance in those whom he addressed to disburse a solid pound, he was prepared to unloose his packet, and to sell them his pennyworth of *Bristol diamonds* for half the sum; and thus several of the ten shilling copies were purchased by the simple, the charitable, the good-natured, or the careless.

It will be perceived that no longer *stat nominis umbra*. The



Editor has lifted his mask and stands revealed—whether for the advantage of the publication may be doubtful. We will not pronounce respecting identity; but we certainly do remember, nearly a score of years since, a solicitor of subscriptions in order to restore a Nova Scotia Baronet and Bricklayer to his hereditary title and estates, who bore a similar name; and we have seen in the late Dr. Adam Clarke's Autobiography some notices of a Mr. C. R. Bond, who is described to have been "a sort of half-boarder and assistant-English-teacher" at the Kingswood School founded by Wesley. "Mr. Bond," continues Clarke, "was a young man of little experience and shallow in talents;" and then, after adding that his "highest ambition seemed to be to reach the exalted place and character of a clergyman," he takes leave of him by saying that "no man can do justice to the life of Mr. Bond but himself. It has been indeed *various* and *chequered*: he is probably still living, but I know not what is become of him."\*

The prefix Reverend, and the suffix laying claim to Emmanuel College, Cambridge, we shall, in courtesy, pass by undisputed; and we proceed to notice a few slight variations between the Advertisement to the Bristol Edition of the Book of Jasher and the Prospectus of its reprint. In the latter, the Traveller in the North of England is said to have retained his copy, not till "there was a rumour of a new translation of the Bible," and then to have "laid it before a noble Earl;" but in order to impart greater vitality to the narrative, the anonymous Peer is changed into a substantial Synod of Ecclesiastics.

"It lay by me for several years, until, in 1750, there was a plan formed for a new translation of the Holy Scriptures in the University of Oxford, by Dr. *Blaney*, and other eminent Divines. This volume was then *translated into modern English* for their judgment, and, on perusal, was highly approved as a Work of great sincerity, plainness and truth. *Their* opinion was that it should have been placed in the Bible before the Book of Joshua."

Dr. Blayney, (not *Blaney*, as the name is printed by Mr. Bond,) the learned and well-known Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Oxford, was employed during the greater part of his life in Biblical Criticisms, and he suggested and published numerous corrections of the existing version of the Scriptures. It is not improbable, therefore, that he began to collect materials for his favourite pursuit in early youth. But since he did not graduate as M. A. till 1753, he must have manifested a precocity almost sufficient to ensure his classification with Crichton and Barretier, if three years before that date, he ranked as

\* *Life of Dr. Adam Clarke*, vol. i, pp. 160, 161.



“an eminent Divine,” and was engaged to assist in a new translation of the Bible.

Furthermore, however, since the value of precision has been discovered by Mr. Bond, we are presented with another name, by which the links in the chain of evidence may be indissolubly strengthened. Instead of the unspecified longevous gentleman who preserved the manuscript, we are told that

“Since 1751 the copy has been preserved with great care by the Reverend William Pownall, brother to Mr. Pownall, many years Master of the School in the Parish of St. Martins in the Fields, who lived to a very advanced age, and died some time since. On the event of his death, it came into the possession of the friend of Mr. Pownall, the present Editor, who conceiving,” &c.

Not the least marvellous assertion contained in this Prospectus remains for its concluding paragraph.

“The first Editor has been honoured with the Autographs of nearly one thousand of *the most literary characters* as subscribers, among whom are many *Prelates and other Dignitaries*, as well as most of the public Establishments of the Country. A second Edition is now called for, and it is hoped the noble and literary characters of the Kingdom will honour this *most ancient and most precious work* with their patronage. Those who may not desire the possession of it, *may aid the publication by their liberal donations.*”

*Sunt qui non habeant : est qui non curat habere.*

Some precaution, however, might now be thought necessary ; for, from a letter addressed to an Irish Periodical, *The Christian Examiner*, in March, 1831, it appeared that Mr. Bond was not the only possessor of the Book of Jasher. A Jew in Liverpool, (neither a sort of person nor of town likely to be behind Bristol or Mr. Bond in any promising mercantile adventure,) had announced his intention of bringing it before the Public, and a very simple-hearted clergyman, who signs himself “Vicar of Donagh,” acquaints the Editor of the Magazine with his own good fortune in having obtained sight of a copy of this same “*curious piece of antiquity.*” During the Irish Rebellion, says this undoubting Vicar, “the Rev. Robert Alexander, D. D., a Divine of high character in his profession, and a scholar of the first rate,” was compelled to take refuge in Pembroke.

“When there, in great privacy, and not a little crippled in his resources, he was visited by a clergyman whose name I regret exceedingly I have forgotten, and from a congenial feeling of taste in literature, profession, and general sentiment, no small degree of friendship arose between them. It occurred one afternoon in their conversation on Scriptural subjects, in which they both took great delight, and were well competent to discuss, that the Book of Jasher was mentioned by Dr. Alex.

ander, deploring its loss, and expressing his regrets that no trace (except the incidental allusion to it, *Josh. x. 13*, and *2 Sam. xviii.*) could be had of a book sufficiently important to be alluded to by inspired writers. The Welsh Clergyman then informed him that he was in possession of a rare Copy of the Work, that he considered it unique, and held it of the highest value ; adding as a very special favour, and one which he had invariably refused, that he would permit Dr. A. to take a copy, but with the strictest injunctions that his permission would rest there, and that its publicity should not under any circumstances take place."

" In the year 1806, having been on a visit in New Ross, where Dr. Alexander resided, I was favoured by his permission to see this curious piece of antiquity, and earnestly requested to be allowed to copy it. This, however, he would by no means grant ; but told me that if I chose to copy the Preface alone, it was at my service ; and that I must do so in his library, lest the temptation to transcribe the whole *would* be too inviting for me to resist : and that he owed it to his friend, and the promise he had exacted, not even to go so far : yet he was willing to do so merely to oblige me : but even after I had copied the Preface, as if some mystery was destined to adhere to the work, the good doctor wrote to me requesting I would destroy it. To this I replied to my worthy friend that he might rest assured no unbecoming use would be made of his indulgence, which sufficiently quieted his anxiety for the time. The doctor has long since paid the debt of nature."\*

The Vicar of Donagh then continues by printing the narrative of Alcuin, to which allusion has been made in the *advertisement* of the Bristol edition, with a slight variation (the cause of which we shall presently explain) from its substance in those pages. From those pages, however, we shall extract it below verbatim. It is long, but as it is a most important document, we must transcribe it without abridgment.

*" The words of Alcuin, which are to be read before the Book of Jasher.*

" I, Alcuin of Britain, was minded to travel into the Holy Land, and into the province of Persia, in search of holy things, and to see the wonders of the east. And I took unto me two companions, who learned with me, under able teachers and masters, all those languages which the people of the east speak ; namely, Thomas of Malmsbury, and John of Huntingdon : and though we went as pilgrims, yet we took with us silver, and gold, and riches. And when we came unto Bristol, we went into a ship bound for Rome, where we tarried six months, and learned more perfectly the old Persic language. Here the Pope blessed us, and said, Be of resolution, for the work ye have undertaken is of the Lord. From Rome we went to Naples, and tarried there three days, and from thence to Salerno, and from thence to Palermo. We went through Sicily, and took Melita in our way, where we abode six days. Hence we sailed for the Morea, visited Athens, Thessalonica, Constantinople,

\* *The Christian Examiner and Church of Ireland Magazine*, vol. xi. (for 1831) p. 191.

Philadelphia, Pergamus, Smyrna, Ephesus, Antioch, Coloss, Cappadocia, Alexandria, Damascus, Samaria, Bethel, and Jerusalem. Here we stayed six weeks, and the patriarch John received us kindly. And after having visited every part of the Holy Land, particularly Bethlehem, Hebron, Mount Sinai, and the like, we crossed an arm of the Persic Gulph at Bassora, and went in a boat to Bagdad, and from thence by land to Ardevil, and so to Casbin. Here we learnt from an Ascetic, that at the furthestmost part of Persia, in the city of Gazna, was a manuscript, wrote in Hebrew, of *The Book of Jasher*. He stimulated us to this undertaking, by observing, that *The Book of Jasher* was twice mentioned in the *Holy Bible*, and twice appealed to as a book of Testimony, and that it was extant before the writings which are now stiled, *The Books of Moses*. We immediately undertook the journey, going by the way of Ispahan, where we tarried three weeks; at length we arrived at Gazna. Here we laid aside the pilgrims' dress, and I hired a house, where we dwelt during our stay in this city, which was about three years.

"I soon became acquainted with the keeper of the library which belongs to the community of this city, and inquired of him concerning *The Book of Jasher*, which the recluse at Casbin had told us of. He said, he had read of such a manuscript in the catalogue of the library, but had never seen it, though he had been custos for forty-five years, but that it was locked up in a chest, and kept among the pieces of antiquities in a separate part of the library. As I lived nigh the custos, so I soon became familiar in his family; wherefore one day I took the opportunity to tell the custos, that I was very much obliged to him for the civilities he had shown me, and particularly for the free access he had given me to the library; at the same time I made him a present of a wedge of gold, in value fifty pounds, which he readily accepted. The next time I went to the library, I begged the favour I might see *The Book of Jasher*. He then immediately turned to the catalogue, where it was written, *The Volume of Jasher*. He conducted me into a long room, where he showed me the chest it was in. He now informed me, that the key was in the hands of the city-treasurer, and that, upon proper application, I might see the volume. The custos introduced me to the treasurer, and related to him the substance of my request. He smiled, and said, he was not then at leisure, but he would consider of it. The next morning I sent John of Huntingdon to the treasurer with a wedge of gold of the value of one hundred pounds, by way of a present. By John he sent me word, that he would meet me at the library about the ninth hour.

"The time being come, the treasurer, the custos, and I, met at the library, when the treasurer having unlocked the chest, showed me the book, which he called, *The Volume of Jasher*. And then he locked the chest, and gave the key to the custos, telling him, that it was permitted that I might read in the volume, as often as I would, in the presence of the custos, and in the library.

"*The Book of Jasher* is a great scroll, in width two feet three inches, and in length about nine feet. It is written in large characters, and exceeding beautiful. The paper on which it is written is for thickness

the eighth of an inch. To the touch it seemed as soft as velvet, and to the eye as white as snow.

"The ark is of Mosaic work, finely and curiously wrought, but time and accidents have very much defaced the external ornaments of it.

"After this I had free access to *The Book of Jasher*. The first thing which commanded my attention was a little scroll, intitled, *The story of the Volume of Jasher*. This informed me, that Jasher was born in Goshen, in the land of Egypt; that he was the son of the mighty Caleb, who was general of the Hebrews, whilst Moses was with Jethro in Midian; that on the embassy to Pharaoh, Jasher was appointed virger to Moses and Aaron, to bear the rod before them; that as he always accompanied Moses, Jasher must have had the greatest opportunities of knowing the facts he hath recorded; that from his great attachment to truth and uprightness, he early received his name, *Jasher*; that it was a common saying in Israel of him, *Behold the upright man*; that Jasher wrote the volume which bears his name; that the ark was made in his life-time; that he put the volume therein with his own hands; that Jazer, the eldest son of Jasher, kept it during his life; that the princes of Judah successively were custoes thereof; that the ark and book in the last Babylonish Captivity was taken from the Jews, and so fell into the hands of the Persian monarchs; and that the city of Gazna had been the place of its residence for some hundred years.

"This excited in me a desire of reading the volume itself. The work was divided into thirty-seven parts or portions. One of these portions I read at this time, and so two every day until I had read the whole through. The custos then informed me, that there were in the two side boxes of the chest, certain notes or remarks, which some of the ancients had made on several passages contained in *The Book of Jasher*. These also I read.

"I had now conceived a great desire of returning to England, with a transcript of *The Book of Jasher*, and of the Notes. Hereupon, I and my companions petitioned the commonalty of the city, that we might have the liberty of taking a transcript thereof. Here we were opposed by the treasurer, and our petition was rejected. Some months after this, it came into my mind, that we would petition to have leave to make an English translation of the said Book and Notes. Accordingly, one morning, having drawn up the petition, I sent John of Huntingdon with it, and a wedge of gold to the treasurer, with a letter desiring his opinion of it. After some days, I received for answer, that he had considered of my request, and would shortly relate the affair to the recorder of the city, and take his opinion thereon. Upon this, I despatched Thomas of Malmsbury with a wedge of gold, as a present to the recorder, together with a copy of the petition I had sent the treasurer. A few days after this, I received directions from the recorder, to attend the next court, and then our petition was granted. The order of court ran thus: 'We grant unto Alcuin, and his two assistants, full liberty and power of translating out of the original Hebrew, *The Volume of Jasher*, with the Notes appertaining thereto, now contained in a chest in the public library of Gazna, into English, and into no other language whatever.

And we likewise order that the said English translation be made in the library, and in the presence of the custos, at such times of the day as shall be most convenient to the said custos.'

"We soon began the translation in this manner: The manuscript was laid on a table, round which the custos and we sat. The custos opened the volume, and we read the first part or portion, and were permitted to set it down in the original; from whence we made each a translation, and then the custos burnt the part we had so transcribed. And this was the manner in which we proceeded, but the custos would not suffer us to carry home any of our papers.

"In fine, after the labour of near a year and six months, we completed the translation of the Book and Notes, to which translation this is prefixed. The treasurer and custos burnt all other papers wrote by either of us, and took from us the translation we had made.

"In this dilemma we remained for some time, till, by a proper application, and by petitioning the court a second time, after having been solemnly sworn, that we had taken no other copy, nor were possessed of any other papers, besides that translation of *The Volume of Jasher*, then before the court, the translation was delivered to us, with a charge, that we should not let any person take a copy thereof in any place we passed through in our return to England; which we solemnly promised; and then we were dismissed, with proper credentials for our return through Persia.

"We now re-assumed the pilgrims' dress, and after a stay of almost three years, left Gazna, and came to Ispahan, from thence to Casbin, and so back to Rome. Here we stayed some time, and I had an audience of the Pope, when I related to his Holiness, that I had seen *The Book of Jasher*, spoken of in *Joshua*, and in the *Second Book of Samuel*. The holy father, who was now ninety-five years of age, turned to the places I referred to, and then cried out, *I have lived to the days of forgetfulness.*

"After a short stay at Rome, we sailed for England, and landed at Bristol, after we had been absent seven years."—*The Book of Jasher*, pp. viii.—xi.

Upon the above statement we must, in passing, offer a few remarks. Alcuin was originally Librarian to Egbert, Archbishop of York; and from his early and intimate acquaintance with the noble Library of Books collected by that munificent Prelate, their custos became the most profound Bibliognostic of the VIIIth century. Of his private history, during his abode in England, very little can be positively asserted; but he is *supposed* to have attained the dignity of Abbot of Canterbury. His subsequent life is fully displayed and illustrated by his own Letters and other writings. Having been employed by Offa, King of Mercia, in an embassy to Charlemagne, he so far attracted the esteem of that great Prince, by his extraordinary abilities and attainments, as to receive the honourable title of *Deliciæ Imperatoris*. By offers of splendid establishment, the Emperor induced

him to settle in the French Court, where he presided over an Academy instituted in the Palace; instructed the monarch himself in Rhetoric, Logic, Mathematics and Divinity; was greatly distinguished at the Councils of Frankfort and of Aix-la-Chapelle, by a successful opposition to certain Heretical opinions propounded by Felix, Bishop of Urgella in Catalonia; and contributed to the foundation or the enlargement of the Universities of Paris, Tours, Fulden and Soissons. It was not without much difficulty that he obtained Charlemagne's permission to pass his declining years in retirement, at the Abbey of St. Martin at Tours, which the Imperial patronage had bestowed upon him; and the administration of which he ultimately deputed to a brother recluse. In that abode, he was chiefly occupied in correcting and transcribing the Scriptures; and numerous MSS., either written by his own hand or under his immediate inspection, became spread abroad to the great benefit of Religion. Baronius mentions, with especial delight, a noble copy of the Bible, supposed to be in the penmanship of Alcuin himself for the Cabinet of Charlemagne, which was preserved in his time (and may still be preserved) in the Library of the Monks of San Filippo de Neri at Rome.

When Alcuin "left the Court" of Charlemagne, and "returned to England, he was further promoted to be Abbot of Canterbury," says the learned and veracious Editor of the *Book of Jasher*, in his Preliminary Dissertation on its antiquity and authenticity. Now if ever Alcuin was in truth Abbot of Canterbury, it was, as scarcely a doubt can exist, *before* he attached himself to Charlemagne. For although it is ascertained that he passed nearly three years in England, between A.D. 790 and A.D. 793, on a diplomatic mission, it is little likely that he would *then* have accepted promotion from Offa, unless he had also designed to make a permanent residence in his native Country. It is far more probable that he was never at all connected with the Church of Canterbury, at least as its Abbot; for he would scarcely have been tempted in the first instance to abandon so high and honourable a charge. We suspect therefore that a confusion has arisen from a similarity of names between himself and a former Abbot. Alcuin's Saxon name was Alewin; which, for the sake of euphony, he Latinized first into Alcuinus, and afterwards into Albinus, accompanying it with the classical prefix Flaccus. Hence he may have been confounded with another Albinus, who is known to have presided at Canterbury sometime earlier.

The Works of Alcuin were first collected by Duchesne, and published at Paris, not as the Editor of the *Book of Jasher* (who hardly ever saw the volume) asserts, in 1600, but in 1617. But



there is a later and fuller Edition superintended by M. Froben of St. Emmerande at Ratisbon, which appeared in 1777. Both these impressions contain, besides the very numerous acknowledged writings of Alcuin, the supposititious Works which have been attributed to him, together with such notices as can be obtained of his *deperdita*; and not any where, in any one of the three above-named classes, is any passage to be found which records either his Oriental travels or the discovery of the *Book of Jasher*. His Correspondence is most voluminous; consisting of 232 Letters, many of them addressed to Charlemagne, and detailing very ample particulars of his literary occupations. Moreover, we possess three separate Lives of this great Scholar; in which are transmitted to us not only the credible and ordinary portions of his history, but such *addenda* also of marvels as were thought requisite for the fame of one who had received canonization. We read therein of miracles which he worked both before and after his death, and of a bodily conflict which he maintained with the Prince of the Power of Darkness, who on one occasion visibly beset him in the seclusion of his Study, and sought to divert him from Book-learning. It is not likely therefore that so important a transaction as his journey to the Holy Land, if it had ever occurred, would have been omitted by his professed Biographers; or that the discovery of a MS., the translation of which into English he considered worthy of so much time, labour, and money, as he is said to have expended upon it, should never be even incidentally alluded to by himself.

It so happens also that among his *Poems* (if we may give that title to the bald Latin and false quantities which he endeavoured to arrange according to a metrical appearance) are several epigraphs for MSS. of the Scripture; some of which contain an enumeration of the received Canonical Books. Is it not probable that *Jasher*, even if not at once boldly inserted by its Discoverer, would have found at least some occasional notice in the body of these compositions? Alcuin must have been proud of his exploit; and, unless he believed in the authenticity of the original document, he would scarcely have troubled himself with the pain and toil of its translation. Nevertheless, with so many fair opportunities before him of embalming his feat in verse, he is wholly silent concerning it: an act of abstinence and mortification which, if it had been really perpetrated, might rank him with justice as the most *Heautontimorumenos* of Ascetics. As our readers may be curious to see a specimen of Alcuin's verse, and as the following reputed Hexameters are not without some Mnemonic recommendation, we venture to subjoin them.



*“ In Sacrum Codicem curâ Radonis Abbatis Monasterii S. Vedasti scriptum.*

*In hoc Quinque Libri retinentur Codice Mosis,  
Bella Ducis Josue, Seniorum et tempora Patrum.  
Ruth, Job, et Regum bis bini namque Libelli;  
Atque Prophetarum Sancti bis octo Libelli;  
Carmina præclari Christi Patris Hymnica David,  
Et tria pacifici Salamonis Opuscula Regis.  
Jungitur his Sophiæ Jesu simul atque Libellus,  
Et Paralipomenis enim duo nempe Libelli.  
Hinc Ezræ, Nehemiæ, Hesther, Judith atque Libelli,  
Et duo namque Libri Machabæa bella tenentes.  
Matthæi et Marci, Lucæ Liber atque Johannis,  
Inclyta gesta tenens Salvantis Sæcula Christi.  
Sanctus Apostolicos Lucas conscripserat Actus.  
Bis septem Sancti per chartas dogmata Pauli,  
Jacobi, Petri, Judæ, et pia dicta Johannis.  
Scribitur extremo Johannis in ordine Tomus.  
Hos lege, tu Lector, felix, feliciter, omnes,  
Ad laudem Christi, propriamque in secla salutem.—*

*Opera, Tom. ii. p. 205.*

Some apology may be thought necessary for continuing to expend our blows upon a mere Phantom—*nube cavâ, et tenuem sine viribus umbram*—or we would otherwise ask the exact position of that City, the *El Dorado* of Biblical Literature, in the “ furthestmost part of Persia,” Gazna, which, we believe, exists in truth in Cabul. We would observe also that the only Patriarch of Jerusalem who filled the Holy Seat during the VIIIth and the early part of the IXth centuries, under the name of John, was John V.; whose rule occupied the seven years between A. D. 795 and A. D. 802. Here then we obtain a fixed season for Alcuin’s pretended visit to Jerusalem. It must have occurred during some portion of those seven years, because we are told that “ the Patriarch *John* received him kindly.” Yet it may be shown from many parts of Alcuin’s writings that after his return from England in A. D. 793, he never quitted the French dominions;\* that in A. D. 796, he took possession of his Abbey at Tours; that in A. D. 798, he excused himself, on account of infirmity, from accompanying Charlemagne in a journey to Rome; and that, about the same time, he was either writing or speaking against the false doctrine of the adoptive filiation of The Son promulgated by the Bishop of Urgella. His embarkation from and return to Bristol, (the

\* Il en revint au bout de trois ans, à la fin de l’année 792, ou au commencement de la suivante. Alcuin de retour en France n’en sortit plus dans la suite. Hist. Lit. de France, tom. iv. p. 297, where very copious authorities are cited.

fortunate spot at which he was to reappear in the XIXth century,) his entertainment by the Patriarch John, and his seven years' Oriental voyaging, are therefore altogether *mistakes*.

One word more relative to this most clumsy part of the forgery. The only Pope during the above period was Leo III., who died in A.D. 816; that is, twelve years after the demise of Alcuin, and who was already "ninety-five years of age" at the time of Alcuin's visit. Even admitting therefore that their interview occurred at the very close of that great man's life, Leo must have survived to the extraordinary age of one hundred and seven years (an age never yet attained by any Pope or Kaiser) without leaving any Historical memorial of that remarkable longevity!

These anachronisms may be thought sufficient to overthrow the tale; and another is adduced by a correspondent of the *Christian Examiner*, in May, 1831, who shows that "we are required to believe that Alcuin, who lived and flourished in the days of Charlemagne, and died in 804, was educated in the University of Oxford, founded by Alfred in 886." Upon a question, however, sunk in such utter obscurity as envelops that of the date of the foundation of Oxford, we are very far from being prepared to pass judgment; and if *that* were the only contradiction in the narrative, we would take the word of Alcuin for his own schooling. More fatal objections are proposed afterwards by the same writer.

"I need scarcely object to the story of Alcuin, who spent his life at the Court of Charlemagne, or in the monastery of Tours, founded under the patronage of that Monarch, and who there closed his eyes in peace and honour, having performed an unrecorded journey in the East, in the habit of a pilgrim, carrying, however, ingots of gold and silver, and riches concealed, I suppose, in his knapsack! Nor of the improbability that the Court of Rome, so jealous at all times of its prerogatives, should have suffered such a work to pass its gates. Nor of the total want of consistency in Alcuin, the learned collector and liberal distributor of knowledge, committing the precious MS. to the care of an unknown Yorkshire clergyman, rather than to the College at York, where, in fact, he did receive his education; or to the Library of his own Monastery at Tours; or, as your ingenious correspondent would possibly suggest, to the Bodleian Library, Oxford."\*

Another Letter, signed H. H. M., appears in the same publication in the following June, to which we shall more fully refer when we come to speak of the contents of the pseudo-Jasher. It is followed by a communication bearing the signature *Bibliographicus*, and dated London, referring to the second Edition of Mr. Hartwell Horne's *Introduction*, (vol. ii. Appendix, p. 123,)

\* *Christian Examiner*, vol. xi. p. 348.

for a key which unlocks the secret of the imposture. The fraud: as Mr. Horne there shows, has been long since exploded and traced home to its author; so long, indeed, that the present frontless reviver of it has no doubt indulged a hope that its former detection may have been wholly forgotten. More than eighty years have elapsed since the first appearance of the *Book of Jasher*; just seventy since the grave closed over the head of its inventor.

One Jacob Ilive, a Printer and Letter-founder, is the original forger; and the following account of his process is given by Mr. Edward Rowe-Mores, in his rare and singular *Dissertation on Typographical Founders and Foundries*, (p. 64,) which may be found cited in a Work of more common occurrence, Nichols's *Literary Anecdotes of the XVIIIth Century*, (vol. i. p. 309.)

“ In 1751 Mr. Ilive published a pretended translation of the *Book of Jasher*, said to have been made by one Alcuin of Britain. The account given of the translation is full of glaring absurdities; but of the publication this we can say, from the information of the only one who is capable of informing us, because the business was a secret between the two, Mr. Ilive in the night-time had constantly a Hebrew Bible before him (*sed qu. de hoc*) and cases in his closet. He produced the copy for *Jasher*, and it was composed and printed, and the same worked off in the night-time in a private press-room.”

Without further proof than we possess, or, indeed, than can now be obtained, it may be unjust to express a suspicion that Rowe-Mores, who was a strange fellow, was *particeps criminis*; and that he himself was the “only person” admitted into the secret, which he afterwards betrayed. But, on his own showing, he had been previously connected with Ilive; who had employed him, when he was an Undergraduate of Queen's College, Oxford, in 1746, to assist in correcting an Edition of Calasius's Concordance.

The title-page of Ilive's volume differs very slightly from that of the Bristol reprint. The former does not contain any notice of a Preliminary Dissertation. It is shorter than its antitype in its mention of Alcuin: “translated into English by Alcuin of Britain, who went a Pilgrimage to the Holy Land,” and instead of the bare extracts from *Joshua* and *2 Samuel* it contains the following paragraph: “This Book is twice mentioned in Holy Scripture, viz. in *Josh. x. 13*, and in *2 Sam. i. 18*, in both which places it is appealed to as a Work of credit and reputation, and as such was at that time had in great esteem.” Mr. Horne has pointed to the sedulous care with which Mr. Bond (who, it will be remembered, at one period of his “various and chequered life” was a *teacher of English*!) has preserved the idiom of his predecessor, “to which is prefixed Various Readings;” and he has

noted similar coincidences of style in the Body of the Work :  
 “ thus *hath* said our Fathers ” — “ thou *judgeth* the people ” —  
 “ whom thou *knoweth* not ” — “ whom thou *doth* not worship ” —  
 and “ thou *hath* spoken.”

A doubt might exist, *primâ facie*, relative to the publication of Ilive's Volume. Its title-page bears no more than, “ *printed* in the year 1751,” and a pencil note (either by some Bookseller or some collector to whom it has formerly belonged) written on the margin of the copy now lying before us, describes it as “ privately printed, and very rare.” But Mr. Horne has produced a criticism from the *Monthly Review* of December, 1751, (vol. v. p. 230), which establishes the point beyond dispute. The Reviewer justly describes the Work as “ a palpable piece of contrivance intended to impose upon the credulous and the ignorant, to sap the credit of the Books of Moses, and to blacken the character of Moses himself.” The narrative of Alcuin is spoken of in like manner, as “ an idle story ” — “ full of blunders, inconsistencies and absurdities.”

Mr. Bond's Advertisement, which we have already cited, is founded, as the reader cannot fail to perceive, on the following Prefatory Letter in the original impression :

“ To the Right Honourable the Earl of \* \* \* \* \*.

“ My Lord,

“ The following translation of *The Book of Jasher* fell into my hands thirty years ago by mere accident. I was travelling in the North of England, to see the country ; and coming into a little town, where I intended to lodge that night, my landlord informed me, that the goods and books of an old gentlewoman, lately deceased, who was upwards of one hundred years of age, the daughter of a clergyman, were that evening to be sold by auction.

“ I went to the sale, where were assembled a parcel of rustics, two or three gentlemen, and as many clergymen. The auctioneer, who was the parish clerk, had prepared no catalogues, so every one looked of (?) the book to be sold as it was handed about. I bought largely, and at length the gentlemen and the clergymen, perceiving they had no share in the auction, withdrew. The auctioneer, in haste to make an end, put up all the pamphlets, manuscripts, and sermons in four bundles. These I purchased, and then I ordered the whole to be sent immediately to my inn ; and before I left the town, I packed the books, manuscripts, pamphlets and sermons up, and sent them to my own home.

“ Among these papers, my Lord, I found the following translation of *The Book of Jasher*, which I last summer communicated to your Lordship on a rumour of a new translation of the Bible. I own that till then it lay by me quite unregarded. Your Lordship on perusal was pleased to approve of it, and to advise its publication as a book of great sincerity, plainness, and truth.

“Your Lordship’s remark I must not here omit, ‘that it was your opinion *The Book of Jasher* ought to have been printed in the Bible before that of *Joshua*.’”

Then follows the testimony of Wickliffe, which we have already noticed. The letter is signed “The Editor,” and dated Nov. 25, 1751.

At the end of Alcuin’s narrative, I live inserted the following paragraph, which Mr. Bond has thought it discreet to omit: “Some years after my arrival I related the adventure to several, and showed them the Work, who advised me not to suffer a copy of it to fall into the hands of the *Stationers*, lest I should incur the displeasure of the Purple. Being now grown old and infirm, I have left it among other papers to a Clergyman in Yorkshire.” The “*Stationers*” appear to have been too hard for Mr. Bond’s digestion. The Latin *Stationarius* is a word originally employed for the *milites stativi*, or such as were posted in *stationes*, the garrisons which occupied conquered towns; at a later date, it was used to signify scribes or notaries, *συμβολαιογράφοι* or *tabel-liones*, who waited at *fixed* spots with apparatus prepared for writing. In the Lower Empire, Postmasters appear also to have been called *Stationarii*. Mr. Horne states from Ducange that *Stationers* (we suppose Ducange means as Booksellers) were unknown in Europe before the middle of the XIIIth Century; and we may add, that even at that time (provided we admit with Conring that the Law regulating the Physicians of Salerno was promulgated by the Emperor Frederic II.,) the proprietors of *stationes* or Apothecaries’ shops were more generally intended by the title *Stationarii*.

One lapse into which Mr. Bond permitted himself to fall in his first impression, and of which I live, in whose steps he was following, appears to have been wholly unconscious, is the absurdity of making Alcuin, all whose extant Works are written in Latin, express himself in modern English. “If he had composed any treatise in any other language,” says Mr. Horne, “it would doubtless have been in the then vernacular language of England, that is, the Anglo-Saxon.” Between the publication at Bristol and the issuing of the Prospectus, this anomaly occurred or was suggested to Mr. Bond; and he endeavours to remedy it, as we have seen in his Prospectus, by stating that the Work was translated from the Anglo-Saxon, for the inspection of the Oxford Divines in 1750. But by whom, it may reasonably be asked, was this translation effected? Anglo-Saxon scholarship is not a fruit to be gathered from every bush; and the portion of it requisite for a task of so great extent, would have entitled its owner to some

remembrance. The translator, although it is not so "written in the *Bond*," must have supplied also the convenient divisions into chapters; for it is not likely that Alcuin, in the VIIIth century, would anticipate an invention not introduced till the XIIIth by Cardinal Hugo.

The *Book of Jasher* itself appears to have been constructed in part from apocryphal writings of the Rabbis; in part from a cento of various scraps stolen from the Pentateuch; and in the remainder from the crazy imaginings of the author himself. The first chapter may be taken as an average specimen of the whole.

“ CHAP. I.

“ 1 *The formation of the world. 3 the light shineth. 7 the earth is productive. 11 the creation of man. 13 the birth of Cain and Abel. 17 of Enoch. 23 the death of Adam.*

“ 1 **WHILST** it was the beginning, darkness overspread the face of nature.

2 And the ether moved upon the surface of the chaos.

3 And it came to pass, that a great light shone forth from the firmament, and enlightened the abyss.

4 And the abyss fled before the face of the light, and divided between the light and darkness.

5 So that the face of nature formed a second time.

6 And behold there appeared in the firmament two great lights: the one to rule the light, and the other to rule the darkness.

7 And the ground brought forth grass: the herb yielding seed, and the fruit-tree after his kind.

8 And every beast after his kind: and every thing that creepeth, after their kind.

9 And the waters brought forth the moving creatures, after their kind.

10 And the ether brought forth every winged fowl, after his kind.

11 ¶ And when all these things were fulfilled, behold Jehovah appeared in Eden, and created man, and made him to be an image of his own eternity.

12 And to him was given power and lordship over all living creatures, and over every herb, and over every tree of the field.

13 And it came to pass, in process of time, that the man begat Cain: and he also begat his brother Abel.

14 And Cain was the first man who tilled the ground:

15 And Abel was a feeder of sheep.

16 And Cain went out and dwelt on the east of Eden, in the land of Nod.

17 And Cain begat Enoch; then did men begin to build cities.

18 And unto Lamech was born Jabel: he was the first who taught men to build tents.

19 And unto Lamech also was born Tubal-Cain: he was the first who wrought in brass and iron, and who builded up the harp and the organ.

20 And Seth begat Enos: then began men by name to call on the Lord.

21 And all the days of the life of Adam, there was rest, and peace, and quiet, unto all men.

22 For they listened unto all things, concerning which he spake unto them.

23 And Adam lived nine hundred and thirty years, and he died."

The period to which it relates extends from the Creation to the close of the rule of Jasher, who, after having been virger or rod-bearer to Moses, judged Israel, after his father Caleb, in A. M. 2600. Moses is described as "learned in all the magic of the Egyptians." By a slip of that faculty which, in a writer of Ilive's description ought to be especially tenacious, the tribute demanded by Pharaoh from the Israelites, which in the fourth chapter is calculated as a *tenth* part of the increase of their lands, (v. 19,) in the sixth, (v. 7,) becomes doubled to a *fifth*. The Passage of the Red Sea, (so far as we understand the account, which is greatly mystified,) is attributed to a natural recess of the tide. The miraculous supply of water in Horeb is not mentioned at all; and instead of the sweetening of the fountain at Marah by a tree which the Lord showed his Prophet, we are presented with the discovery of a fresh spring by the sagacity of Miriam—a lady always mentioned with peculiar complacency, and occasionally, indeed, to the disparagement of her brother. Most of the statutes and ordinances which the genuine Scriptures ascribe to the dictation of God himself, are here made to proceed from the advice of Jethro, who delivers a sort of Parody on the Decalogue. His suggestions are opposed by Miriam, who well nigh occasions a sedition, which is prevented only by her temporary imprisonment. Instead of the anger of the Lord being kindled against her mischievous interference, so that she is smitten with leprosy for her transgression, at her death it is pronounced that there "arose up no one like unto her of the daughters of Jacob; no, not even unto this day."—(Ch. xv. v. 16.) When Korah, Dathan and Abiram rebel, *the ground does not cleave asunder under them, neither doth the earth open her mouth and swallow them up, so that they go down alive into the pit; nor doth a fire come out from the Lord and consume the two hundred and fifty men that offered incense; but they die a much more common death; and (if we may so speak, without an undue appearance of levity,) in consequence of the issue by Moses of a Writ de Hæretico comburendo.*

"12 And Moses commanded the Levites, saying: Up now, slay Korah, Dathan and Abiram, with those that are with them, with fire, even as the Lord hath spoken unto me.

"13 And Korah, Dathan and Abiram, [with the two hundred and



fifty men of the children of Israel, perished by fire before the door of the tabernacle of the Lord."—(Chap. xxi.)

The contumelious epithet applied to Rahab in the Book of *Joshua* is purged away by her transformation into "one of the Princesses of Jericho," and a woman eminent for wisdom." She is represented as favouring the invaders on account of her extraction; her mother, a woman of Midian, having borne her to an Israelitish father: and the aspersions on her character arise only from some idle words of the King of Jericho, who stigmatised her pacific advice as "the counsel of a harlot."—(Ch. xxvii.)

The Passage of the deep and rapid Jordan (a miracle described in the Book of *Joshua* with a minuteness of detail which might appear to defy any sceptical resolution of it,) is effected in the *Book of Jasher* by the ordinary expedient of a Bridge; for in no other way can we interpret the following words.

"10 And the wood, whereon the children of Israel passed over Jordan, stayed upon the face of the waters six days and six nights."—(Ch. xxviii.)

Such being the exact length of time occupied by the passage of the whole congregation, "they, their wives, their children, their cattle, even all their possessions." And more especially, that signal arrest of the course of Nature for the record of which appeal is made by the genuine Scriptures to the *Book of Jasher*, is noticed in that Book as here presented to us, solely as an aspiration of the conqueror; expressed in terms which the Hebrew indeed might admit, and which are therefore introduced into the margin of our version, but which by no means adequately demonstrate the plenary manifestation of His omnipotence which it pleased God to display. "11. And Joshua said, Sun, *be thou silent* upon Gibeon: and thou, Moon, shine thou on the valley of Ajalon."—(Ch. xxx.) In the apparatus of "Various Readings," (how arising from a single MS. we know not,) prefixed to the Work, a nearer approximation is made to the truth. "Sun, rest thou on Gibeon; and shine thou, Moon, on the valley of Ajalon." But how weak and frigid are even these words when brought in contact with the two verses which follow the similar passage in *Joshua*! 13. *And the Sun stood still, and the Moon stayed until the people had avenged themselves upon their enemies. Is not this written in the Book of Jasher? So the Sun stood still in the midst of Heaven and hastened not to go down about a whole day.* 14. *And there was no day like that before it or after it, that the Lord hearkened unto the voice of a man: for the Lord fought for Israel.* And what deduction can we make from the defective representation, except that it is offered with a treacherous intention to disparage the supernatural agency?

The pseudo-Jasher terminates 400 years before the occurrence of the slaughter at Gilboa. It would be unjust, therefore, if we were to complain that the order given by David to instruct the Israelites in the use of the bow, which the inspired Word expressly informs us is written in the *Book of Jasher*, is not written in the *Jasher* of Messrs. Ilive and Bond.

The chief difference between Ilive's edition and the Bristol reprint occurs in the notes. The "Testimonies," which we extract below, and all the notes but one in the first chapter, are omitted in the latter; as are likewise all those to the end, after two upon chapter xvii. In their stead is substituted, at the commencement, a short apology for the Creation; and at the close a hortatory peroration beginning with the received form of "Let us therefore make a due improvement hereof." Besides these, is inserted a note on the Passage of the Red Sea, chiefly taken, as Mr. Horne has remarked, from Dr. Hales's *Analysis of Chronology*. All these are from the pen of the editor, and as they may at any time be obtained for twenty, or even for ten shillings, it is quite needless that we should transcribe them. But Ilive's matter, although cheaper at first, (for we learn from Mr. Horne that the cost price altogether was but half a crown,) will now probably be sought in vain at any price. Little, therefore, as it may be worth intrinsically, it possesses all the value which difficulty of attainment can impart; and on this ground we shall present some of it to our readers.

"Testimonies and Notes concerning the Book of Jasher."

"Testimonies and notes concerning the Book of Jasher, taken from the original now in the ark, with the names of the persons who wrote them, translated from the Hebrew, Chaldee and Persic."—Alcuin.

"The ark or chest is divided into three parts; the place in which the Book of Jasher is kept is locked. The Book is deposited in the middle division, and is for length three foot, and for breadth three foot; the partitions on each side are eighteen inches each; so that the length of the ark is six foot and the breadth is three foot, and the height is three foot, with four wings and two staves. On the top of the ark, on each side the part in which the Book is, is a little slit, that whoever remarketh on what they read in the Book of Jasher may slide it through the slit into either place."—Jazer.

"When any one is desirous to read in the Book of Jasher, he comes to the custos and reads in the presence of the custos, and makes his remarks if he is so minded, and then the custos puts the said remarks into the ark by the way of the slits, which are on the top covered with brass, to be pushed away on such occasions."—Ben Zaddi.

"The Book of Jasher is now in the custody of one of the Princes of Judah, in the city of Jezer, and is kept in an ark made of Cyprus; and it is the custom of all the wise men who resort to the ark to read it; (for

it is had in great esteem and is now consulted as an oracle ; ) and if any one remarketh thereon, he writes his remarks before the custos, and the custos puts it into the ark, from whence it is never estranged."—Zadoch.

" Jasher is a faithful historian, free from fiction, upright and an honest man."—Othmil.

" Jasher was named **יָשָׁר** ; for that he was an upright man, both as to his words, his dealings and his stature ; for that he had wisdom not only to direct his own conduct, but also that of the commonweal of Israel. He was upright in himself, for he never polluted himself with the women of the nations ; he was the husband of one woman, his sister Azuba, who died scarce two months before him. He was married to her before the Exodus and before the law was given by Moses, which afterwards made such marriages sinful and abominable. He was always attendant on Moses and Aaron, and he bore the rod or wand of divination before them. He built a city in the land of Gilead in the Tribe of Dan, whilst the people were yet in the Wilderness, and settled his eldest son Jazer there, from whom it took its name. He built a second city after he crossed Jordan, in the Tribe of Judah, and called it Jezer. Jasher in his days directed the people of Israel to walk uprightly before God, to live peaceably and to love mercy. He reigned over Israel five and twenty years."—Phineas.

" Jasher being rod-bearer to Moses, and his brother Aaron knew the facts he hath related, and he is on that account to be relied on. The author of the Book of *Joshua* appeals to the Book of Jasher, as a testimony ; as doth the author of the Book of *Samuel*. And though, in the Book of *Judges*, Jasher is not mentioned by name, as the successor of Caleb, yet we believe at this day that he did judge Israel from the death of Caleb his father to his own death. There is a testimony to this purpose in the Book of *Judges*. ' And it came to pass, when the Judge (that is, when Jasher) was dead, that the people returned, and corrupted themselves more than their fathers.' The account of things which Jasher has given seems to me as little notes which he had made for his own memorial, and designed for private use ; and are of this use to the Public, that *they corroborate all the grand truths of the Five Books of Moses*, though the Work appears to be wanting of that sublimity and *stupendiousness* so remarkable in the writings of the former."—Ezra.

Mr. Horne's *Bibliographical Notes* are intended to form part of the seventh edition of his *Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures*, now preparing for publication ; and he has thrown them into the form of a separate Pamphlet only for private distribution. They contain the titles of Ilive's volume and of the Bristol reprint, contrasted in parallel columns ; the extracts from Mr. Rowe-Mores' *Dissertation*, which we have printed above ; an extract from Chalmer's *Biographical Dictionary* relative to Ilive ; and the Criticism from the *Monthly Review*, which we have already noticed. Then follow five very satisfactory reasons for rejecting the narrative of Alcuin ; and the

following examples of contradiction between the Books of Moses and Joshua and that of Jasher.

**"The Books of MOSES and JOSHUA are contradicted by JASHER."**

GEN. xxii. 2, 11—13 And He [God] said, Take now thy son, thine only son Isaac, whom thou lovest, and get thee into the land of Moriah; and offer him there for a burnt-offering upon one of the mountains which I will tell thee off. . . . And the Angel of the LORD called unto him [Abraham] out of heaven. . . . And he said, Lay not thine hand upon the lad, neither do thou any thing unto him. . . . And Abraham lifted up his eyes, and looked, and, behold, behind him a ram caught in a thicket by his horns: and Abraham went and took the ram, and offered him up for a burnt-offering in the stead of his son.

Exod. ii. 1—5. relates the birth and exposure of Moses in an ark of bulrushes on the banks of the river Nile, and the discovery of him by Pharaoh's daughter.

5—8. And when she [Pharaoh's daughter] saw the ark among the flags, she sent her maid to fetch it. And when she had opened it, she saw the child: and, behold, the babe wept. And she had compassion on him, and said, This is *one* of the Hebrews' children. Then said his sister to Pharaoh's daughter, Shall I go and call to thee a nurse of the Hebrew women, that she may nurse the child for thee? And Pharaoh's daughter said unto her, Go. And the maid went and called the child's mother. And Pharaoh's daughter said, Take this child away, and nurse it for me, and I will give *thee* thy wages. And the woman took the child and nursed it.

Exod. i. 22. And Pharaoh charged all his people, saying, Every son that is born ye shall cast into the river.

Concerning the particular subjects of Moses' education the Book of Exodus is silent.

Numb. xxxii. 11, 12. Surely none of the men that came up out of Egypt, from twenty years old and upwards,

CHAP. iii. 19—21. And when Isaac was twenty and five years old, Abraham heard a voice saying, Take thy son and slay him, and offer him up a burnt offering in the land wherein he was born. And Sarah spake unto Abraham and said, The holy voice hath not so spoken: for remember thou the words of that voice which said unto thee, I will make of thee a great nation. And Abraham repented him of the evil he purposed to do unto his son: his only son Isaac.

v. 9—12. And Jochebed the mother of Moses, with Miriam his sister, came unto Pharaoh's daughter: and Jochebed said, Behold here the son of thy handmaid! And Pharaoh's daughter said, What wist ye? And they said, Thy father hath commanded that this infant be slain: yea, and that all the Hebrew males as soon as they are born be slain also. And Pharaoh's daughter said, Give unto me the child. And they did so. And she said, This shall be my son.

iii. 13. And it came to pass, that the wrath of Pharaoh was turned away from slaying the males of the Hebrews.

iii. 14. And the child Moses grew and increased in stature: and was learned in all the magic of the Egyptians.

xxxv. 3, 4. It is affirmed that, after the death of Moses, Joshua, and Caleb, the people were without a leader, and

shall see the land which I swear unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, because they have not wholly followed me; save Caleb the son of Jephunneh the Kenezite, and Joshua the son of Nun.

Josh. ii. relates the mission of the two men whom Joshua sent to explore the land of Canaan, and who "went and came into an *harlot's* house, named Rahab, and lodged there;" together with their covenant with her, who was a Canaanitess.

Josh. iii. 14—16. It came to pass . . . As they that bare the ark were come unto Jordan, and the feet of the priests that bare the ark were dipped in the brim of the water, (for Jordan overfloweth all his banks all the time of harvest,) that the waters which came down from above, stood, *and* rose up upon an heap, very far from the city Adam, that is beside Zaretan: and those that came down towards the sea of the plain, *even* the salt sea, failed, *and* were cut off; and the people passed over right against Jericho.

Josh. vi. 17. 20, 21. 24, 25. And the city shall be accursed, *even* it, and all that *are* therein, to the LORD. . . . The people went up into the city, every man straight before him, and they took the city. And they utterly destroyed all that *was* in the city, both man and woman, young and old, and ox, and sheep, and ass, with the edge of the sword. . . . And they burnt the city with fire, and all that was therein. . . . And Joshua saved Rahab the harlot alive, and her father's household, and all that she had.

Josh. vii. relates the circumstance of Achan's secreting a Babylonish garment, two hundred shekels of silver, and a wedge of gold of fifty shekels' weight, contrary to the divine command: for which crime he and all he had were destroyed in the valley of Achor.

that Phinehas and the elders of Israel "named Jasher the son of Caleb by Azuba, seeing he is an upright man. And moreover this we know, that he hath seen all the wonders wrought in Egypt, in the wilderness: even all the mighty works that have been done."

xxvii. 8. Rahab is styled "one of the princesses of Jericho;" and in v. 8, she is represented as saying, "I also am the *daughter of an Israelite by a woman of Midian.*"

xxviii. 10. And the wood whereon the children of Israel passed over Jordan stayed upon the face of the waters six days and six nights.

xxviii. 15, 16. 18. Then Rahab sent unto Joshua, saying, Let me intreat with thee for my nation that they may live. And Joshua answered and said, As many as save themselves by flight may live: but whosoever shall be found in Jericho shall surely die the death. . . . And the people of Jericho fled from the city every one to the mountains.

xxviii. 20—25. Achan is represented as charging Joshua with having "taken from the congregation all the gold, all the silver, and all the brass: even all the spoil of the city of Jericho, and given it to the tribe of Levi." For which crime he *ALONE* was stoned."—

*Horne, pp. 7, 8.*

Mr. Horne then, at some length, establishes the fact, which it is impossible for any one to doubt for a moment, that the Bristol Edition of Jasher is "an unacknowledged reprint of Iliye's for-

gery, with some unimportant variations." We need not follow him through either the coincidences or the differences further than to add that

"The following are the only additional material variations between the two publications, which, after a careful collation, the author has been able to detect.

(No. I.) ILIVE'S BOOK OF JASHER,  
1751.

(No. II.) BOOK OF JASHER, 1829.

Ch. i. 17. Cain *conceived and bare*  
Enoch

20. Seth *conceived and bare* Enos

ii. 1. Lamech . . . . *conceived and*  
*bare* Noah

v. 9. ye

xxiii. 8. *doetn*

13. nor

xxxv. 28. *Debora*

xxxvi. 11. *thou commandeth*

Ch. i. 17. Cain *begat* Enoch.

20. Seth *begat* Enos.

ii. 1. Lamech *begat* Noah.

v. 9. you.

xxiii. 8. *doest*.

13. or.

xxxv. 28. *Deborah*.

xxxvi. 11. *thou commandest*.

"The variations in the edition of 1829 are such as might be made by any careful compositor, and cannot (we conceive) in any degree affect the identity of the two publications."—p. 10.

Having thus, with his customary diligence and accuracy, systematically exposed the imposture, Mr. Horne concludes by noticing another apocryphal Jasher.

"There is extant a rabbinical-Hebrew Book of Jasher, printed at Venice in 1625, which is an explanation of the histories comprised in the Pentateuch and Book of Joshua. Bartolucci, in his *Bibliotheca Rabbinica*, states that it contains some curious but many fabulous things; and particularly, that this book was discovered at the time of the destruction of the temple at Jerusalem in a certain place, in which an old man was shut up, in whose possession a great number of Hebrew books was found, and among them the Book of Jasher; which was first carried into Spain, and preserved at Seville, whence finally it was taken to Naples, where it was first published.—(Vol. iii. p. 934.) Bartolucci also mentions (in p. 868) a treatise on the Jewish Laws, composed by Rabbi Tham, and called *Sepher Jasher*, or the Book of Jasher, which was printed at Cracow in 1617."—Horne, p. 11.

We have spoken above of a Letter signed H. H. M. in the *Christian Examiner* of June, 1831. The writer very satisfactorily shows, from internal evidence, that the *Book of Jasher* is a fabrication; and he deservedly reprobates it as giving encouragement to the Neologists, who seek to explain all the miracles of Scripture by natural causes. The chief contradiction of Holy Writ remarked in this Letter, which we have not already noticed, consists in the settlement of Jasher (who is proved to have been twenty-five years of age at the time of the Exodus) in the land of Canaan, when we have an express assertion in the Bible that none

of the Hebrew male adults who had quitted Egypt, with the exception of Caleb and Joshua, were permitted to enter the promised land.

A few particulars of Ilive himself may be derived from some other Works which he has left behind him, and the perusal of which has convinced us of his insanity. In 1730 he published an octavo Tract entitled *The Layman's Vindication of the Christian Religion*, which he dedicated to George II. Although Ilive at that time does not appear to have attained the full extent of crazy infidelity which he afterwards betrayed, some germs of his subsequent deterioration of Moses are visible in those pages. He takes pains to establish the Cosmogony as delivered in *Genesis*, and he argues that Moses was in truth the author of the writings which pass under his name; but concerning their divine origin he is not only altogether silent, but he evinces his disbelief by the following pretty clear inuendo. "I allow that the Decalogue or Ten Commandments do, if observed, tend to the happiness of men in particular, and of Society in general; and *this certainly was the intention of Moses in giving them.*"—p. 127.

The cloven foot peeps out far more visibly three years afterwards. Ilive's mother, it seems, entertained not less wild opinions than himself, and it is probable that his mental distortion was hereditary. "Solely to employ leisure" he had composed an "Oration" on John xiv. 2.—*In my father's house are many mansions*; the chief tenets inculcated in which production regard a plurality of Worlds, an assertion that this Earth is Hell, that the souls of men are apostate Angels, and that the penal fire is immaterial. This rhapsody was first put together in 1729, and so delighted was the old Lady with her son's ingenuity, that after having frequently heard the composition read during her last illness, she enjoined by her Will, dated April 20, 1733, that "it should be read publicly in Stationers' Hall (if possible) within fourteen days after her decease, to as many of her acquaintance and others as shall be minded seriously to hear the same."

Mrs. Ilive died on the 29th of August in the same year; but the Stationers' Company, not approving her son's doctrine, refused the use of their Hall for the delivery of his *Oration*. He found means, however, to obtain permission from the Brewers and the Joiners, in the Halls of both which Companies he held forth according to his mother's Testament. The following passages in his *Oration* in some measure illustrate those workings of his mind which afterwards effervesced in the *Book of Jasher*.

"As to Moses, I conceive he was a man of great courage and policy. How far these are necessary to establish a new system of such rites and ceremonies as he instituted, I leave to those who after they have read



my notes, can think them of divine appointment. And here I declare that I do not look upon Moses, as a Lawgiver of the Jews, to be an impostor; but commend him for attempting to make his brethren a great People by separating them from the Nations. And so far as he did establish the Law of Natural Religion, though burdened with grievous rites and ceremonies, so far his Laws was (were) of God; or, if you please, of Divine appointment, and no further."—*Preface*, p. vii.

In a *learned* objection which he raises, without any reference to the doctrine of the Greek Article, to the English version of the clause in the Lord's Prayer, *Deliver us from evil*, he puts a question which may be thought somewhat *naïve* when it is recollected that it proceeds from the future Author of the *Book of Jasher*.

"But why these pious frauds? Why should false translations be made to serve any turn?"—p. 3.

Reverting to Moses, he asks—

"How came he to make Aaron a Priest? Why, Jethro taught him the trade. What heavy burdens! What strange rites! What wonderful stories did he impose upon his brethren, under the sanction of *Thus saith the Lord!* 'Tis evident to every man who reads his history, that if it had not been for his cunning and policy, his power and arms, he had never established his grievous Religion—a Religion which taught the Jews to worship God with Pagan Rites."—p. 35.

And finally,—

"Only I add my single opinion that these rites and ceremonies were not instituted by the God of Heaven, but by Jethro and Moses; and that the words, *Thus saith the Lord; As the Lord commandeth Moses;* should be read, *Thus saith Jethro; As Jethro commandeth Moses.*"—p. 39, note.

This last-cited passage sufficiently proclaims the object for which the *Book of Jasher* was subsequently fabricated.

From Wilson's *History and Antiquities of Dissenting Churches* (vol. ii. p. 290), we learn that Ilive afterwards hired Carpenters' Hall, opposite *Bedlam*, in which he continued to harangue in favour of infidelity. With some other Works ascribed to his pen it has not been our lot to meet: but Chalmers mentions *A Dialogue between a Doctor of the Church of England and Mr. Jacob Ilive upon the subject of the Oration*. Neither have we ever seen the *Third Part* of Holwell's *Interesting Events in Bengal*, in which, according to the same authority, the *Oration* is highly praised. But it is well-known that some of Holwell's *Senilia* are replete with whimsical fancies concerning *Angelico-zoology*: and, moreover, the unhappy experience of that otherwise respectable Gentleman, in the Black Hole at Calcutta, may have im-

bued him with not unreasonable prejudices respecting the temperature of the Globe, and have inclined him to give too easy credit to one of Ilive's tenets, which we have already mentioned. We learn farther from Chalmers, that for publishing *Modest Remarks* (a commencement which always implies that want of modesty is about to follow) *on the late Bishop Sherlock's Sermons*, Ilive underwent two years' confinement in Clerkenwell Bridewell; during which period he published, as it was very natural he should do, *Reasons offered for the Reförmation of the House of Correction in Clerkenwell*. Thenceforward, indeed, he became a thorough-paced Reformer; projected numerous Treatises for universal amendment, which Gough has enumerated in his *British Topography*; endeavoured to restore its primitive Constitution to the Stationers' Company, and closed his mischievous, turbulent and miserable career in 1763.

For Ilive may be advanced the saving plea of Madness: but what excuse is to be offered for Mr. Bond? He has not even the perverse credit of having *invented* the lie which he fosters; he is only its base and subordinate propagator. It may be believed that Ilive in his ravings persuaded himself that he might acquire reputation by his fraud, and that he forged in the hope of gaining honour, just as it is said that Antony, King of Navarre, picked pockets out of sheer Love of Fame. But the sole motives, which actuate his successor in the same dirty path, must be a sordid desire for lucre, a diseased craving for money, a Bulimia of Avarice. In our character of Beadles of Literature we have thought it a duty to exhibit the lash to this daring plagiarist, who has been seeking to grow fat upon stolen garbage: and in taking leave of him, as we hope, for ever, we have satisfaction in stating that he has already begun to disgorge some of his ill-gotten prey, and that his *Prospectus* has recently disappeared from circulation.

---

ART. VII.—1. *The Book of the Psalms of David, in English Blank Verse: being a new Poetical Arrangement of the sweet Songs of Israel; adapted to the use of general Readers, with a View to the more perfect Understanding, and consequent relish and appreciation of, the subject-matter of those Divine Compositions.* By the Rev. George Musgrave, A. M. B. N. C. Oxon. 1 vol. 8vo. Rivingtons. London, 1833. pp. 506.

2. *A Paraphrase of the Psalms, executed in Blank Verse: with strict attention to the Notes and Commentaries of Bishops Horsley, Horne, &c. and closely approximated to the Text of the*

*authorised Versions of the Old Testament and the Liturgy.* By P. J. Ducarel, Esq. 1 vol. 8vo. Hamilton, Adams and Co. London. 1838. pp. 304.

THERE is an old story to be found, we presume in the erudite pages of Mr. Joseph Miller, of a Frenchman, who, having been vanquished and laid prostrate by an Englishman in battle, humbly demanded his life; upon which his antagonist replied, that he could not comply with *that* request, but should be happy to grant him any *other* favour in his power. We almost fear that the compliments, which we may pay to Mr. Musgrave and Mr. Ducarel, will be deemed of nearly as little value after the great deduction, which we must make in the first instance, as the proffered civilities of the victorious Englishman to his fallen foe, accompanying the *polite* intimation that he must put him to death. Yet we feel bound to state our opinion, that the idea of translating the Psalms into blank verse is an error of judgment. And we come equally to this conclusion, whether we look to the nature of the undertaking itself, or to the utility which it is likely to carry with it, or the reception which it is likely to meet.

Now, as to the nature of the design in itself, it *does* appear to us that the character of the Psalms is either *Lyric* or *Elegiac*. They are Hebrew odes or spiritual songs. But surely the varied pauses, the long-drawn links of harmony, the majestic, but somewhat tardy march, so essential to the being of blank verse, are quite incompatible with their symmetry of opposition and parallelism. Accordingly, we find in both these versions, a monotony of versification, a recurrence of the same cadences, a balance of clauses in the same sentence, agreeable because natural and proper in other kinds of metre, but entirely destructive of the true excellence or perfection of blank verse; and we also find an attempt to conquer these defects by a somewhat tedious circumlocution and a pompous array of words, in which no fresh conceptions are conveyed. Mr. Ducarel, indeed, entitles his version "a paraphrase of the Psalms:" and yet Mr. Musgrave is the more paraphrastic of the two, although he disclaims an inclination "to versify with all the license of poetical privilege;" and adds—

"The Author is content to have foregone the opportunities of embellishing the following pages with displays of flowery paraphrase and dilatation, and to aspire to no credit beyond that of having respected the most approved interpretations of the Hebrew text, and of having transmuted the Psalms of the English Bible into a form of verse, which seemed to him, upon reflection, the best calculated to expand and reveal their meaning."  
—*Preface*, pp. vi. vii.

We might go on to say, that the quick transitions, the sublime apostrophes, the noble and often abrupt exclamations of the

Psalmist, are obviously adapted to a more rapid and spirited measure than blank verse:—and we might assert, further, that English blank verse may be admirably suited to poems of considerable length, where the jingle of rhyme, or the return of the same stanza, would be fatiguing;—or to historical and dramatic poems, where either of these things would be utterly misplaced; but that in *short* compositions, which pour forth feelings, rather than describe events, the ear catches with pleasure the recurrence of the same sounds, and is accustomed to it, and expects it. We have said enough, however, to express our belief, that the garb of blank verse is not the dress best suited for “a new poetical arrangement of the *sweet songs* of Israel:”—and, in point of fact, even if we could suppose ourselves competent to such a task, we should no more think of turning the Psalms into blank verse, than we should think of turning “*Paradise Lost*” into strophe and antistrophe.

Still less, if we may continue to quote Mr. Musgrave's words, do we think such a “poetical arrangement” well “adapted to the use of general readers, with a view to the more perfect understanding, and consequent relish and appreciation of, the subject-matter of these divine compositions.” For here we come to the inquiry, whether such a version can be put to much use, or is likely to meet with a very enthusiastic welcome. We fear *not*. The tide of public favour is now running strongly against verse of all kinds, and yet *more* strongly perhaps against blank verse than any other kind whatever. The question then unfortunately intrudes itself, “*cui bono?*” A version of the Psalms in blank verse is scarcely fit either to be “*said or sung.*” For the purposes of common perusal, the fine and almost metrical prose, either of the Bible or the Prayer Book, will, we imagine, be preferred, both from its inherent attraction, and, again, from long familiarity and cherished associations, to a poetical paraphrase: and for the purpose of *singing*, blank verse is of course out of the question.

But “many men, many minds.” Let us cite what Mr. Musgrave thinks; only, by the way, entering our decided protest against the truth of the description in the latter part of the extract.

“The primary design, therefore, of the present work is simply this:—that in a serious and sober form of verse, the structure of which bears, on that very account, a nearer resemblance to the vernacular prose translation of the Psalms, than any other metre, these beauteous effusions of devout and holy thought, praise, prayer, confession, intercession, and thanksgiving may commend themselves more sweetly to the sense, and more intelligibly to the comprehension of casual readers, than in the *crude*

*and uninviting* (only because more literal and *rugged*) diction of the Liturgical Translation."—*Preface*, p. xix.

After all, the matter is a matter of opinion. And it may be well that the Psalms should appear in every possible shape; for in no shape, perhaps, *can* they appear without presenting to us some fresh and hitherto unappreciated charm. And assuredly, in our preceding observations, we have been actuated by any thing rather than an unfriendly disposition to Mr. Musgrave or Mr. Ducarel; for we entertain a sincere wish to soften the feelings of disappointment, which these gentlemen may experience as to the circulation of their volumes, by showing to themselves and others, that, if their success be incommensurate with their expectations, the circumstance is attributable to the nature of the design, and not to a deficiency of skill or power in the execution. The *execution* deserves great praise.

That such is the case extracts from both versions would form the most satisfactory evidence. We are sorry that we can only afford two from each: and we leave our readers to judge for themselves which version is the most commendable:—whether the simpler diction of Mr. Ducarel, who states his version to be a paraphrase; or the more copious and ornate style of Mr. Musgrave, who certainly allows himself a considerable liberty for—

“A versifier, who, rejecting as much as possible the aid of adscititious ornament, or the introduction of pleonasms foreign to the simple dignity of Scriptural diction, has been more anxious to enlighten the understanding, than to recreate the ear.”—*Preface*, p. v.

We take the first Psalm, as the fairest specimen for both parties; giving precedence to Mr. Musgrave on account of his cloth.

#### PSALM I.

“Blessed is he whose mortal life's career  
It's onward course maintaineth unapproach'd  
Of sin's unhallow'd counsel, and whose feet  
Untrodden leave the devious paths of guilt.  
Blessed of Heaven, who rejects the seat  
Which impious scorn hath chosen for it's own,  
But with devoted heart rejoicing turns  
'To Heaven's law—the precepts of his God—  
To muse therein the noontide hour, and dwell  
In meditation on their truth by night.  
His way of life resembleth that fair tree,  
Which, on the streamlet's genial margin rear'd,  
Yields in due season it's abundant fruits;  
And, with a kindly all-productive growth,  
'Mid leaves of never-fading verdure thrives.

Far other doom awaits the sons of vice :—  
 Like chaff upon the scattering winds upborne,  
 The cause of sinners, when their hour is come,  
 And judgment is awarded, shall not stand ;  
 Nor in the pure assemblies of the just  
 Shall Guilt maintain it's station ;—for the Lord  
 Our God, with all-observant care, regards  
 The progress of His righteous servants' course,  
 While all the counsels, all the ways of vice,  
 Untimely failing, in perdition end."—*Musgrave*, pp. 1, 2.

PSALM I.

" Blessed is he, whom from his steadfast course  
 Ungodly counsels shall not lead astray ;  
 Who, nor with sinners lingers in his path,  
 Nor sits in mockery in the scorner's seat ;  
 But whose delight is on Jehovah's law  
 To meditate from morn till eve with joy.  
 Oh ! he shall flourish, vigorous as a tree  
 Upon the brook-side springing, soon to yield  
 A copious harvest of its fruits : his leaf  
 Shall never wither, and whate'er he doeth  
 Shall prosper, favoured of the Lord. Not so  
 The ungodly, whom the winds, like chaff, away  
 Shall scatter o'er the land : in the dread hour  
 Of judgment shall they fall, nor find a place  
 Amidst the assembled righteous before God.  
 Ah ! well the all-seeing eye of God discerns  
 Their ways who choose the right ; while, who pursue  
 Unrighteous course, shall His just wrath destroy."  
*Ducarel*, pp. 1, 2.

Our other selection shall be the 24th Psalm, as it affords a good sample of the *manner* of Mr. Ducarel's paraphrase ; while it demonstrates to our view the unsuitableness of blank verse for a translation of the Psalms. For what shall we say of chorus or semi-chorus taking up the strain in the *middle* of a line of blank verse ?

PSALM XXIV.

Ascension Day.

MESSIAH'S EXALTATION.—[HORSLEY.]

[*To the Beloved.—An Ode.*]

*Chorus.*

" Earth is the Lord's, the world's vast compass His,  
 And all that dwell its ample bounds within ;  
 For on the seas He builded it ; upon  
 The floods He planted its foundation.

*Versions of the Psalms.**First Voice.*

Who

Shall unto Zion's sacred brow ascend ?  
Or who within God's sanctuary dare stand ?

*Second Voice.*

Even he whose hands are clean, whose heart is pure,  
Whose mind swells not with vanity and pride,  
Who sweareth not, his neighbour to deceive,—  
He shall attain the blessing of the Lord,  
And from the cup of His salvation quaff  
Of righteousness.

*Chorus.*

Such is the godly race  
Of them that seek him, them that seek thy face,  
Oh Jacob !—

*Semichorus.*

Lift on high your heads, ye gates !  
Be ye uplift ye everlasting doors !  
The King of Glory enters.

*Second Voice.*

Say, O say,

Who is the King of Glory, who is He ?

*Second Voice.*

It is the Lord Jehovah, strong and mighty,—  
The Lord Jehovah, in the battle mighty.—

*Semichorus.*

Lift up your heads, ye gates, be ye uplift  
Oh ! everlasting doors.

*Single Voice.*

Ha ! who is He ?

The King of Glory, who ?—Jehovah, Lord,  
The Lord of Hosts ; of Glory He is King !”\*

*Ducarel, pp. 40, 41.*

## PSALM XXIV.

“ The Earth and all that it's abundance yields,  
This world itself, and they that dwell therein,  
Are all the Lord's ; for His creating hand  
It's firm foundations laid above the seas,  
And fix'd them o'er the river-floods supreme.  
Who shall ascend the mount of the Most High ?  
Or who shall in His sanctuary stand ?  
He who in hand and heart alike is pure,  
Who scorns the Heathen mock'ry, and would spurn

“ \* The plan of the 24th Psalm, according to the letter of it, is beautifully delineated by Bishop Lowth, in his 27th Lecture. The Ark of God is supposed to be moving in a grand and solemn procession of the whole Israelitish nation, towards the place of its future residence, on Mount Zion (1 Chron. xv.) : the Psalm is sung whilst ascending the mountain, announcing the sovereignty of Jehovah, &c. and is applicable to the Christian Church, and the Ascension of our Lord into Heaven.”



The taint of Perjury's evasive fraud.  
 God's blessing shall await him ; mercy's gifts  
 Shall from the God of his salvation flow ;  
 And such in heart are all, who seek Thy grace,  
 O Thou ! whom Jacob haileth for his Lord.  
 Lift up your heads, ye gates ! Arise on high  
 Ye ancient portals ! and the glorious King  
 Shall enter :—' Who is this in glory crown'd ?'  
 It is the Lord Jehovah, strong in might—  
 The Lord triumphant in the fields of war.  
 Lift up your heads, ye gates ! Eternal doors,  
 Arise ! and entrance give to glory's King !  
 ' Who comes with Glory's diadem adorn'd ?'  
 The mighty God of hosts, the Lord Himself—  
 He is the King, and weareth glory's crown."

*Musgrave*, pp. 63, 64.

It would be unjust to omit that much valuable information, with respect to the peculiar character and meaning of the Psalms, is to be found in Mr. Ducarel's preface, and the extracts from preceding authors, which are interspersed through his volume.

And here we might stop. But we are anxious to say just two or three words upon the general question of translations of the Psalms, as it relates to the public service of our Churches. There are, we conceive, some fifty translations, good, bad, or indifferent ; but the only versions regularly authorized are the version of Sternhold and Hopkins, and the version of Brady and Tate ; and which of the two is the most abominable is a problem so nice, that we shall not even attempt the decision of it, except so far as to declare our opinion that if, with reference to the reputation of the inspired poems, the former version seems the most atrocious offence, the latter is nevertheless the deepest injury. The version of Sternhold and Hopkins is indeed, by common consent, and almost to a proverb, an outrage, not to say a burlesque, upon the sweet Psalmist of Israel : and we shall, therefore, dismiss it by merely hinting, that it has yet occasionally a rough strength and raciness about it, more tolerable, in our estimation, than the weak tameness and mawkish dilutions of its succeeding rival. Brady and Tate, it is true, write smoother lines ; but let the reader just compare the vigour and spirit of the following brief passages from the Psalms themselves, with the tawdry ornaments, the stupid amplifications, the faults at once of redundancy and deficiency in Tate and Brady's translation, and then say whether it ought even to be allowed.

We have happened to pitch upon the 12th, the 14th, the 19th, the 107th, and the 137th Psalms ; and that our equity may be unimpeached, we shall merely give the commencement of each of these Psalms as it appears in the Prayer-Book, and then the un-

meaning expletives by which Messrs. Brady and Tate have expanded their translation.

Ps. xii. v. 1. Help me, Lord, for there is not one godly man left: for the faithful are minished from among the children of men.

Ps. xiv. v. 1. The fool hath said in his heart, there is no God. They are corrupt, and become abominable in their doings: there is none that doeth good; no, not one.

Ps. xix. v. 1—5. The heavens declare the glory of God: and the firmament sheweth his handy work.

One day telleth another: and one night certifieth another.

There is neither speech or language: but their voices are heard among them.

Their sound is gone out into all lands: and their words into the ends of the world.

In them hath he set a tabernacle for the sun: which cometh forth as a bridegroom out of his chamber, and rejoiceth as a giant to run his course.

Ps. cvii. O give thanks unto the Lord: for he is gracious: and his mercy endureth for ever.

Ps. cxxxvii. By the waters of Babylon we sat down and wept: when we remembered thee, O Sion.

If we looked for *botches* in the *middle* of the Psalms, what should we think of a *hundred* such passages as the following?

Ps. xlix. v. 13. This is their foolishness: and their posterity praise their saying.

Verse 20. Man being in honour hath no understanding: but is compared unto the beast that perish.

Here then we think that some alteration might be made in a particular part of our Church Service, with the attainment of a

Since godly men decay, O Lord,  
Do thou my course defend;  
For *scarce these wretched times afford*  
One just and faithful friend.

*Sure wicked fools must needs suppose*  
That God is nothing but a name:  
Corrupt and lewd their practice grows;  
*No breast is warm'd with holy flame.*

The heavens declare thy glory, Lord,  
*Which that alone can fill;*  
The firmament and stars express  
Their great Creator's skill.

The dawn of each returning day,  
Fresh beams of knowledge brings;  
And from the dark returns of night,  
Divine instruction springs.

Their powerful language to no realm  
Or region is confin'd;  
'Tis nature's voice, and understood  
Alike by all mankind.

Their doctrine doth its sacred sense  
Through earth's extent display;  
Whose bright contents the circling sun  
Doth round the earth convey.

No bridegroom, on his nuptial day,  
*Has such a cheerful face:*  
No giant doth like him rejoice  
To run his glorious race.

To God your grateful voices raise,  
*Who does your daily patron prove;*  
And let your never-ceasing praise  
Attend on his eternal love.

When we, *our weary limbs to rest,*  
*Sat down by proud Euphrates' stream,*  
We wept, with *doleful thoughts oppress,*  
And Sion was our *mournful* theme.

How great their folly is who thus  
*Absurd conclusions make!*  
And yet their children unreclaimed,  
*Repeat the gross mistake.*

For man, how great soe'er his state,  
*Unless he's truly wise,*  
*As like a sensual beast he lives,*  
*So like a beast he dies.*

manifest advantage, and without trenching upon any sacred or venerable principle. Or, perhaps, we ought hardly to use the word *alteration*; for what happens as the case now stands? There is no uniformity in our churches as to the Psalms which are sung. In one church the old version is still retained: in a second, the new is substituted: in a third we find selections from both: in a fourth, not either of the versions, nor a selection from the two. In many churches, and in more chapels, some private collection of Psalms and Hymns is introduced; in some few instances, we understand, the composition of the minister himself, who is thus exhibited in the decorous and dignified light of making a profit by the sale of his own Hymn-books for the use of his own flock. Thus the want of a good version of the Psalms, sufficiently and properly authorized, leads to the actual irregularity of almost *ad libitum* selections; some, we allow, unexceptionable in their individual character; but others again, we scruple not to add, impregnated with a tone *at least peculiar*, and containing many expressions offensive not merely to just taste, but to sound religious feeling.

Might not either a new translation be made, or a good selection from versions already published; and, after a careful revision by competent persons, and under the sanction of the highest authorities, be sent forth for the adoption of all or any places of worship throughout the kingdom? It would be a good in many points of view to render the singing in our churches more a *congregational* act than it is at present; and it is a great mistake to conceive, that, for the most part, our congregations, as they are now constituted, cannot appreciate, and will not feel, the poetical merits or demerits of what they sing. It would be a good in many points of view to attain a more complete *uniformity* in this portion of our public worship, as well as to make it *really* a thing of public and united worship, instead of a performance enacted, as it too often is, only by the clerk and the charity-children. The dissenters, we fear, understand much better than most churchmen, the power of psalmody, not simply in attracting a congregation, but in attaching it to a house of prayer, and building up its faith, and giving wings almost of fire to its devotions. They act, at least, as if they understood it much better. One large step would be to procure a *third* version, or an excellent selection, of the Psalms; and to take care that only that selection, or the new and old versions already in use—which would under such circumstances soon be superseded—should be allowed in churches or chapels belonging to the established religion of the country.

It is for us merely to suggest this matter: we would gladly see it taken up by persons abler and more exalted than ourselves.

**ART. VIII.—*Lives of Eminent Christians.* By the Rev. T. B. Hone. London, 1833.**

THE writer of *Lives of Eminent Christians* has no need to seek for them in the chronicles of strange lands. Thanks be to God, our own country has been the fruitful mother of good men; our churchyards are hallowed by their ashes; the very streets we walk in have been sanctified by their footsteps; their memory goes with us into the noise of every day life, and returns with us to our firesides. Being dead, they yet speak in the thousand antique volumes which time has spared. We can listen to the charmed speech still flowing from the lips of the golden-mouthed preacher,\* and cheer our drooping spirits with the eloquent comfortings of him, who seems, of a truth, to have drank of the “wine of angels.”† But not within the borders of their native country alone are the names of her children recorded—they live in the heart of the distant Indian; they are pronounced with love and veneration by the lips of men burnt by the Afric sun. They have penetrated wherever the human step hath trod, or the human voice been heard. Through perils by land, through perils by water, and among wild regions and wilder men, have they pursued a path of pain and difficulty; pain, felt only to be despised, and difficulties, encountered only to be overcome. Nothing could daunt the inflexible energy of their minds, or divert it from the goal at which it aimed.

Mr. Hone has selected for the present volume four names, deservedly dear to our Christian literature: Archbishop Usher, Dr. Hammond, Bishop Wilson, and John Evelyn. Two out of the four, at least, were not only eminent Christians, but men of the most extensive learning, and peculiarly well fitted on that account to show the beautiful lustre which religion lends to the highest acquirements of the intellect. Our limits will not suffer us to do more than make a few rapid observations. To begin with Archbishop Usher:

“There is something more transitory,” observes Mr. Hone, “in the nature of literary distinction than is commonly imagined. The successful labours of a whole life, employed in the most arduous research, enable succeeding students to advance by an easy ascent to the height at which the earlier traveller had arrived with so much toil and fatigue; they avail themselves of the paths which he has devoted his days and nights to make smooth and free, and their time and strength are reserved for further enterprises. Thus one man labours, and others enter into his labours; and the meed of public applause, which he enjoyed for a season, is transferred to those who have lengthened

\* St. Chrysostom.

† Jeremy Taylor.

the track which he first opened, and which he made easy for them to traverse."

These words have a melancholy truth when applied to Archbishop Usher. His patient learning, his indefatigable industry, and his single-hearted labours in the cause of religion, are all forgotten by the world, like the cloud of yesterday. Even his immortal work, *The Annals of the Old and New Testament*, which carried his name throughout civilized Europe, is seldom, we suspect, in the present day consulted save by some silver-haired student in the silence of a college library. It sleeps undisturbed amid dust and cobwebs on the most neglected shelf. It were a vain endeavour to seek to disperse the shades of oblivion which thus gather round these ancient and honoured names; but their possessors have left other memorials behind them, less subject to the influences of time, and the changes of taste and opinion; though the theological acquirements of Usher are fully known to few, his gentle piety and Christian meekness have won tears and praise from many hearts. His pen, even when engaged in controversy, had no polemical bitterness in it; and in the celebrated Defence of the Church, in which he was associated with the eloquent Bishop Hall against the illustrious Milton, he has been justly pointed out as the only combatant whose primary object was not to mortify and wound the feelings of his adversaries.

The "reverses" of Usher are narrated with much simplicity and truth by Mr. Hone:

"Alas!" he exclaims, "that Archbishop Usher should have been compelled to accept alms at the hands of strangers! But these trials made him feel more strongly than ever that his rest was not here; and his good hope, through faith, supported him amidst his journeyings—his perils of waters and of robbers—his perils by his own countrymen, and among false brethren—through weariness, and painfulness, and watchings often—through afflictions, necessities, and tumults—through evil report, and good report. He could say in every dispensation, as unknown, and yet well known, as dying, and behold we live; as chastened and not killed; as sorrowful, yet always rejoicing; as poor, yet making many rich; as having nothing, yet possessing all things."

Beautifully is it said in the "Christian year:"

"From darkness here and dreariness  
We ask not full repose;  
Only be Thou at hand to bless  
Our trial-hour of woes.  
Is not the pilgrim's toil o'er paid  
By the clear rill and palmy shade?  
And see we not up earth's dark glade,  
The gate of heaven unclose?"

Never was the heart of the suffering prelate so depressed that he did not receive consolation from the truths of the Gospel ; though grief was his guest for a season, joy came to him in the morning. In the most dreary paths of his wandering through the wilderness he was never forsaken by Faith and Hope. Faith that erreth not, and Hope that maketh not ashamed. He knew that Mercy dwelt behind the blackest cloud, and would soon break out with undimmed lustre.

It has been said that Oliver Cromwell bestowed a pension upon Usher—this is doubted by his chaplain Dr. Parr, and Mr. Hone has not been able to throw any light upon the question. We remember to have met with an allusion to a pension granted to the archbishop, in Thurloe's State Papers, but we have not the work at hand to consult. This matter ought, if possible, to be cleared up.

We wish Mr. Hone had given one or two specimens of the archbishop's sermons ; he quotes a passage from the edition of some which were preached at Oxford, and printed from the notes of three clergymen present at their delivery :

"The persuasion of Armagh's incomparable learning," they say, "the observation of his awful gravity, the evidence of his eminent and exemplary piety, all improved to the height by his indefatigable industry, drew students to flock to him, as doves to the windows. It joys us to recollect how multitudes of scholars, especially the heads of our tribes, thronged to hear the sound of his silver bells ; how much they were taken with the voice of this wise charmer ; how their ears seemed, as it were, fastened to his lips. Here you might have seen a sturdy Paul, a persecutor transformed into a preacher ; there, a tender-hearted Josiah lamenting after the Lord, and with Ephraim smiting on his thigh, saying, '*What have I done?*' Others with the penitent Jews so stabbed to the heart, as that they were forced to cry out in the bitterness of their soul, '*Men, brethren, fathers, what shall we do?*' These were some of the blessings from on high which attended these sermons."

At p. 72 another interesting anecdote is told of the effect produced upon the congregation by his simple and affectionate oratory :

"He happened to be in London, and was importuned by the Countess of Peterborough, and other kind friends, to preach at St. Martin's church. That was the parish in which he was living, and the old church was not so large but that he might be heard in it. Accordingly, he complied with their wishes, and after having preached at some length chanced to look upon the hour-glass, the sands of which appeared to his defective sight to have run out. So, as he was always fearful of diminishing the usefulness of his sermons by making them so long as to weary the hearers, he concluded his discourse, and told the congre-

gation that since the time was past, he would leave the rest he had to say on that subject to another opportunity, if God should please to grant it to him, of speaking again to them in that place. But the congregation finding out his mistake, and that there was some of the hour yet to come, and not knowing whether they might ever have the like happiness of hearing him again, made signs to the reader to let him know that the glass was not run out, and that they earnestly desired he would make an end of all he intended to have spoken."

The chief characteristics of Usher's sermons are simplicity and affectionate earnestness; unlike the general pulpit-eloquence of his contemporaries, they are not encumbered with the gay tulips and useless daffodils which Jeremy Taylor objected to. He considered that the waters of salvation needed nothing to recommend them, save their own purity and healthfulness.

The life of Usher could not be more appropriately followed than by that of Dr. Hammond, whom Bishop Burnet calls a man of "great learning and of most eminent merit," and who, during "the bad times, had maintained the cause of the church in a very singular manner." Our remarks, however, must be confined to one portion of his life.

Mr. Hone's account of Dr. Hammond, after his ejection from the University of Oxford, is very satisfactory, but he might have found some additional facts, not indeed of any particular importance, but still interesting, in nineteen letters written by Dr. Hammond to Mr. Peter Staninough, and Dr. Nathaniel Ingelo. These letters were published by Francis Peck, the well known author of the *Desiderata Curiosa*, from the originals communicated to him by the Rev. Robert Marsden, Archdeacon of Nottingham, and the Rev. John Worthington. They came into the possession of Mr. Marsden's father by his marriage with the relict of Mr. Staninough.

After being "thrust" out of Christchurch by the parliament visitors, to use the words of Anthony Wood, Hammond was imprisoned several weeks in a private house at Oxford, and was subsequently removed through the influence of his brother-in-law, Sir John Temple, to the residence of Sir Philip Warwick at Clapham, in Bedfordshire, where he met with very kind entertainment. He says (letter iii), "I received your letter and the great favours of the two gentlemen, but far from the place to which they were directed. I am long since removed from Oxford to a kind of *Libera Custodia* at Mr. Warwick's house near Bedford."

In our quotations from these letters the orthography of the writer is almost in all cases preserved.

M. Staninough seems to have been residing in the house of



Sir Robert Pye, in the capacity of tutor, when the sixth letter was written—Dr. Hammond's course of reading for his friend's pupil deserves to be extracted.

"Your course entered upon I do fully approve; and when you have occasion to add any more, it may either bee Moralists, Greek (if the disciple be capable of them) or els Latine: Tullye's Offices and the rest of that volume, Seneca, some parts of Pettrach, and then, if you please, *Aquinas Secunda Secundæ*. And from thence ascending to divinity, beginning with *Grotius de Veritate*, or *Morney*, on falling on the Gospels with *Grotius's Annotations*. And besides the course of History, through which you know your guesses, (*qy.*) I know no other politickes (I am sure none more fit for a Christian,) than strict rules of living from the *Sermon on the Mount*, &c. I write this now in full speed. When you deliberately call for any more particular direction, I shall hope to be at more leisure to answer you distinctly."

From Clapham Dr. Hammond removed to Westwood, in Worcestershire, the residence of Sir John Packington, an eminent loyalist. Here he enjoyed rest from his labours. A small patrimony we are told, which the hand of the spoiler had spared, enabled him to dispense something in charity, and Sir John and "the good lady" Packington testified by their attentions how sensible they were of the virtues and excellence of their inmate. Hammond was, indeed, a pleasant addition to their fireside circle. He was gentle in his temper, agreeable in his manners, and had "a good voice and a taste for music, and could sing a little." Here he resumed his habits of active study. He rose, his biographer tells us, from his bed at four or five o'clock, rarely so late as six, and he did not retire to rest till midnight; for he was both fond of learned research, and so sensible of the snares that lay in the path of idleness, that he had acquired a deep aversion to it, and always besought others to shun its dangers. Even while he dressed his servant read to him, and in this way he became acquainted with the contents of several volumes; and as he took his walk through the shady avenues which surrounded the mansion of Westwood, a book was his constant companion.

A letter written from Westwood, September 10, 1658, affords a pleasing illustration of the foregoing observations. It is copied from the *Nineteen Letters* already mentioned, and shows how carefully Hammond watched the proceedings of the literary world through his "loopholes of retreat."

"September 10, 1658.

SIR,—I received your's of August 24, long after at London, but found not leasure to answer (it) till this day, on which I arrived at Westwood, the place of my country retirement; whence I hasten (the first thing I do) to discharge my debt; and to tell you, that Mr.

P[ieux] his *Αυτοκατάκρισις*, &c., is now come forth, and is now likely to be the last he will have occasion to write on that subject. Mr. Baxter, I believe, diverts him to another.

"I am sorry to hear of the addition of that Jewish to all the former giddynesses of the age. I had heard of Mr. Brabourne's late booke, which he unwilling, it seems, was brought to; having resolved to be silent though he had resumed his opinion.

"As to the *Prolepsis*, Gen. ii. 3, I never saw reason to doubt of it, or consequently to assign any other date to the Sabbatick Law, than that of Exod. xvi. And it is considerable (which as I remember, Mr. Mead noted) that the seven dayes, immediately preceeding the first Manna Weeke, were spent ether in travailing which was contrary enough to the sabbatizing the last day of them.—

\* \* \*

Your other quære—*Utrum misericors Deus restituat poenitenti omnia bona, quæ per peccatum perdiderat?* in general speaking is easily answered. For grace, (both the gift of God, and the favour of God, adoption, justification, and right to salvation,) which are the general comprehensive heads which contain *omnia bona quæ per peccatum perdiderat*, are certainly restored to the poenitent. But whether so great a degree of these be restored to the poenitent, as is secured to the just man that needs no repentance, I have no ground from scripture to determine. For as, on one side, 'tis said there that there is more joy in heaven for the poenitent; and that the returning prodigal was feasted, &c., when the sonn that was always with the father was not; which inclines to the affirmative; so 'tis said by way of answer to that, as to an objection, that all the father had, was his, and that that was more valuable to him than one feast. And beside, the joy and the festival proves not the *bona omnia* in the same degree. The safest way then of resolution I think is, that he that hath sinn'd, when he returned, should by double diligence qualify himself, as St. Paul did; and then no doubt to him will belong that of—*the last shall be first.*"

The *Αυτοκατάκρισις* referred to was "Self Condemnation Exemplified," &c. published in 1658, and containing reflections on Calvin, Beza, &c. and more particularly on Hobbes, the philosopher of Malmesbury.

When the fainting spirits of men began to revive at the prospect of the restoration, and a season of peace dawned after so long a storm, Dr. Hammond's health was rapidly declining. The habits of application he had pursued with unremitting diligence for so many years, had entailed upon him diseases which rendered it necessary for him to shorten his hours of study, and threatened a speedy termination of his life. His own sufferings, however, were forgotten in his anxiety for the welfare of his country. He even viewed the returning prosperity of the royal party with "fear and trembling;" for while he believed, observes Mr. Hone, "that the righteous cause was about to triumph, he feared that

as religion had been made subservient to ambition, and assumed as a cloak by those who had evil purposes to promote, the nation might be disgusted with real piety, and hurry into the opposite extremes of open profligacy and profaneness. It had been his prayer that whenever God should see fit to turn the captivity of the nation, it might be in a state of repentance." He was afraid that the evils which had been endured would not be converted into "medicinal advantages;" and that many would become "intoxicated by the pleasanter draughts" of prosperity.

On the 16th of March, 1659, he writes :

"I am very glad that the troubles that were so near as to menace, were not permitted to take any hold on you. I hope that the feares of that sort, are now *prettily* well dispelled, if our unreformed sins do not call them again upon us. It appears not improbable, that the tabernacle of David which hath been in the dust so long, may ere long be reædified; but whether or not with those diminutions which may extort teares from them that compare the second with the former ædifice, I am not able to divine."\*

For his own part he did not contemplate the honours which seemed to be in store for himself, with any sentiments of joy. His hours had passed away in such "a constant equable serenity and unthoughtfulness in outward accidents," as his friend Bishop Hall expressed it, that to him no change could promise greater personal felicity :

"I must confess," he one day observed, "I never saw the time in my life wherein I could so cheerfully say my *Nunc Dimittis* as now. Indeed I do dread prosperity, I do really dread it. For the little good I am now able to do, I can do it with deliberation and advice; but, if it please God I should live, and be called to any higher office in the church, I must then do many things in a hurry, and shall not have time to consult with others, and I sufficiently apprehend the danger of relying on my own judgment."

We cannot refrain from making one more brief extract from these letters, beautifully illustrative of Dr. Hammond's uncorrupted and affectionate heart. Acknowledging, on the 27th of March, 1660, the receipt of a volume of sermons from Dr. Ingelo, the vice-provost of Eton, he says: "It is very long since I had the least conversation with my very much loved old friend, Eton College, and there is no means whereby I am better pleased to renew it. About a year and three quarters since I was near as the way betwixt Itcham and old Windsor lead me."

So fresh and warm were the feelings of boyhood in the heart of one, about whom the shadows of the grave were already gathering, for on the 25th of April following, this faithful servant

\* Nineteen Letters,

of his Lord was called home to receive his reward. He perished in the autumn of his days, and although the bereaved church might well "weep over her departed son," yet for himself, as his present biographer has remarked, the "change was happily timed; as it released him from bodily sufferings which would have continued to afflict him to the end of his days—rescued him from the temptations of prosperity, which he feared—saved him the pain of witnessing the increase of vice and irreligion, which he sorrowfully anticipated—and bore him to those pure and peaceful habitations for which he had been constantly preparing."

It is singular that his death should have happened on the same day on which Parliament was "assembled for the purpose of recalling the king." He was buried in the parish church of Hampton with an unostentatious simplicity well becoming the peaceful tenor of his life.

Mr. Hone introduces the memoir of the admirable Bishop Wilson with some very pleasing observations:—

"Among the most delightful associations connected with the world of spirits is that idea which originates in our belief in the communion of saints, and which represents to us the children of God who have lived upon earth at various periods of time, as forming one fold under one great shepherd.

"Of those who, in humbly pursuing the paths of faith and holiness, are looking forward to be introduced into this company of the redeemed—there are few who have not fixed upon a chosen circle of just men made perfect, from whose society they expect more particular pleasure. The idea is so natural, so intimately blended with all our better feelings, and really forms so beautiful and strong a tie to the invisible world, that it is one which it cannot be wrong to entertain. The chosen circle, doubtless, consists in the first place of those, whom having seen, we have known and loved; kindred and friends who have died in the Lord attach us to the citizens of heaven, and cause us to remember Zion with a more vivid interest.

"Tis sweet as year by year we lose  
Friends out of sight, by faith to muse  
How grows in paradise our store."

*Christian Year.*

"But it includes others also, belonging to distant countries or times, whose hands we have never clasped, whose voices we have never heard, whose bodily presence we have never seen, but with whose minds and characters we have become intimately acquainted and strongly attached. The simple-minded Christians of primitive times—the confessors who being faithful unto death were to receive a crown of life—the staunch defenders of the faith, especially when their conscientious firmness and boldness in their Lord's behalf were associated with gentleness of spirit. These claim and possess the affection of the sincere Christian  
\* \* \* \* But still that company comprises others, perhaps even more beloved than these, whose lives may not have been distinguished by

any very remarkable incidents, yet to whom we are linked in the closest union. They are those to whom we owe the thoughts and impressions from which we derive the greatest satisfaction ; those who in bequeathing to us wholesome counsel, have inscribed in their holy pages a picture of their own minds."

How many beautiful thoughts does this passage awaken in the heart ! How many dear familiar faces, long loved and lost, seem suddenly to revive in the quiet of our memory, not cold and pale with the shadows of the tomb, but glowing with the warm airs of paradise ! How many voices speak to us with the very tones of childhood ; how many young feet dance by us with a sound of music ! Precious, indeed, to the bereaved spirit is this Christian anticipation ! It rolls away the cloud from our eyes, it turns the shades of sorrow into the light of morning. We can gaze upon the vacant chair without weeping ; we can think of the departed with a placid joy as of one who has set out on a pleasant journey to his Father's house, there to wait for the coming of the beloved. Thus strengthened, we may go forward boldly on our pilgrimage, neither fainting nor murmuring, but ever turning our face when wearied to the Garden of Rest, whither those whom we pine for have gone before us. Scarcely less delightful is the belief that we may meet in that celestial country the glorified members of the great literary priesthood, who laboured while on earth to exalt the name of their Maker ; Milton, and Raphael, and Dante, and the rest of the immortal Band. The enthusiastic painter Blake had some romantic ideas upon this subject.

The works of Bishop Wilson obtained the praise of Dr. Johnson.

" To think on Bishop Wilson with veneration," says the critic writing to the prelate's son, " is only to agree with the whole Christian world. I hope to look into his books with other purposes than those of criticism, and, after their perusal, not only to write, but to live better !"

Bishop Wilson's literary talents were the least of his merits ; as an author he can hardly take his place by the side of Taylor, or Barrow, or Sherlock, the masters of Israel. His productions are all principally remarkable for their purity of feeling and amenity of manner ; his warnings to repentance are the persuasions of a parent ; his words of peace are the comfortings of a brother. Every thing he uttered came unadulterated from the heart. His *Sacra Privata* form a heavenly book, and the tears have been dried in many a mourner's eyes by the mild and tender spirit of merciful pity which speaks in every page.

We look upon the work as on the religious journal of the writer's life ; the record of his daily communings with God, when " he entered into his closet and shut to the door," and lifted up

his voice to Him who "seeth in secret." Well may Mr. Hone exclaim, that—

"The good bishop, though dead, still speaketh; his voice is still heard in accents of counsel and comfort; he humbles the readers to dust with a sense of sin, makes them feel the need of a saviour, and gladdens them with tidings that God has actually provided for their need; he leads them on from strength to strength, renewing their humble confidence in Christ, and giving fresh fervour to their prayers for such a measure of God's praise as may prepare them, before they go hence, for the glorious company of the redeemed, by changing them into the image of Christ."

The old age of this venerable disciple was full of honour; the tree showed by its verdure that it had been planted by the waters of life. In 1795, when he was seventy-two years old, the bishop made his last visit to England, and a delightful anecdote is preserved of his reception at court by George the Second and his consort.

"He came into the drawing-room in his usual simple dress, having a small black cap on the top of his head, with his hair flowing and silvery, and his shoes fastened with leathern thongs instead of buckles. His appearance excited some surprise, and joined with his well-known piety and virtues awakened feelings of the deepest veneration. It is related that as soon as he entered the presence-chamber, the king, stepping out of the circle of his courtiers, and advancing towards the bishop, took him by the hand, and said: 'My lord, I beg your prayers.' Nor was the queen less impressed with reverence for his character; she wished to keep him in England, and with that view offered him translation. One day when she was conversing with him, she turned round to her levee, and said, 'See here, my lords, is a bishop who does not come for translation!' 'No, and please your majesty,' was his remark, 'I will not in my old age leave my wife because she is poor.'"—p. 240.

Mr. Hone was very happy in his choice of Evelyn for his "*Lives of Eminent Christians*," for in him we do, indeed, behold "the man of taste, the philosopher, and the acquaintance of princes, bowing at the foot of the cross, desiring to walk in all the ordinances and commandments of the Lord blameless, and confessing that the Gospel of Christ is his comfort, his pleasure and his glory." In his life also, piety wears so sweet and unassuming an aspect, and mingles so unaffectedly in all his joys and sorrows, prosperity and disappointments, that she cannot fail of winning many hearts. The religion of Evelyn is neither morose, nor bigoted, nor fanatical: he was not afraid to worship the Almighty in the beauty of his works. He may be said with truth to have looked from nature up to nature's God, for the mighty forest and the humbler garden were equally his delight. The yellow prim-



rose by the river's brim was more than "a yellow primrose to him," for he discovered in it the workmanship of a Divine Architect, and recognized the power of the Deity in the smallest drop of silver dew that glittered on its bosom. His early days were passed in the beautiful scenery of his father's estate at Wotton. "The house," he says, "is large and ancient, and so sweetly environed with those delicious streams and venerable woods, as in the judgment of strangers, as well as Englishmen, it may be compared to one of the most pleasant seats in the nation, and most tempting for a great person and a wanton purse to render it conspicuous. It has rising grounds, meadows, woods, and water in abundance." Here, amid the gardens, fountains and groves by which the mansion was adorned, young Evelyn imbibed the love of rural pursuits and country pleasures which imparted so healthful a tone to his future life, and which never forsook him. It was, therefore, a cause of great rejoicing to him when he was enabled to purchase the sequestered estate of his father-in-law, Sir Richard Brown, at Sayes Court, near Deptford. To this "green retreat" he retired from the tumult of the world, beguiling his time with the conversation of his religious and literary friends, and in the bosom of an affectionate family.

" Friends, books, a garden, and perhaps his pen,  
Delightful industry employed at home;  
And nature, in her cultivated trim,  
Dress'd to his taste, inviting him abroad :—  
Could he want occupations who had these?"

The tastes of his wife, whom he had married at a very early age, were in perfect harmony with his own: she was his companion in the study and the garden, aiding and cheering him in all his occupations. On his arrival at Sayes Court he found nothing there, to borrow from the narrative of his present biographer, but a "rude orchard;" the rest of the estate was "one entire field of a hundred acres." His first step was to set out "an oval garden," which, he says, was "the beginning of all the succeeding gardens, walks, groves, enclosures and plantations there." Soon after he laid out an orchard, and in the course of time planted "every hedge and tree, not only in the gardens and groves, but about all the fields and house, since 1653, except those large, old and hollow elms in the stable-yard; for it was before all one pasture field to the very garden of the house, which was but small. From which time," Evelyn adds, "I repaired the ruined house, and built the whole end of the kitchen, the chapel, buttery, my study above and below, cellars, and all the outhouses and walls, still-house, orangery, and made the garden, &c., to my great cost."



The principles of ornamental gardening, Mr. Hone remarks, which now give beauty to our country villas, were not understood in those times. Art had not yet been placed under the tuition of nature, but the taste of the English (agreeing with that of the Italians and French) was pleased with long straight walks and flower-beds cut out in corresponding figures—round, square and oval—with evergreens cut into fantastic shapes, and clipt hedges to form the boundary. Milton alone, says Horace Walpole, seems with the prophetic eye of taste to have conceived, to have foreseen modern gardening; and in describing Eden, he speaks of the river which, with many a rill, watered the garden, and fed

“ Flowers worthy of Paradise, *which not nice art*  
*In beds and curious knots*, but nature boon  
 Pour'd forth.”

We think these lines go to establish the converse of the argument pursued by Walpole, and adopted by Mr. Hone; for though the poet does somewhat disprovingly allude to the “nice art” which shaped the flowers into “beds and curious knots,” yet the garden which he goes on to portray as a place “of various view,” with “lawns on level downs” interspersed among “groves of rich trees,” with caves

“ Of cool recess, o'er which the mantling vine  
 Lays forth her purple grape, and gently creeps  
 Luxuriant,”

is not in reality a garden answering to the modern idea attached to the expression. It is, in fact, such a scene as might have been suggested to the mind of Milton by some romantic vision of luxuriance in Italy. Be this as it may, the garden at Sayes Court was as stiff as any of its contemporaries, of which the reader may soon satisfy himself by referring to the picture of a similar garden at Wotton, given in Evelyn's *Memoirs*. But if it be faulty in the eyes of a modern critic, it was not so in the estimation of its amiable artist. Here he employed himself in cultivating his flowers, with an enthusiasm which induced the poet Cowley to say, that he knew no person who derived more happiness from a garden. Here too the materials of some of his most valuable works were collected. A study of the “trees of noblest kind for sight, smell, taste,” enabled him gradually to prepare his *Sylva*; and his orchard furnished him with the facts he afterwards embodied in his *Pomona*. To prove that he was not above the humblest office of a gardener, he wrote also *A Discourse on Salads*. It is gratifying to know that his piety grew with his rural learning.

“ It is,” he says, “ a transporting consideration to think that the in-

finitely wise and glorious Author of Nature has given to plants such astonishing properties: such fiery heat in some to warm and cherish; such coolness in others to temper and refresh; such pinguid juice in others to nourish and feed the body; such quickening acids to compel the appetite, and grateful vehicles to court the obedience of the palate; such vigour to support and renew our natural strength; such ravishing flavour and perfumes to recreate and delight us; in short, such spirituous and active force to animate and revive every faculty and part, to all the kinds of human, and I had almost said, heavenly capacity too."

That agreeable gossip Pepys, who was an intimate friend of Evelyn, calls this garden "a most beautiful place," and "a lovely noble ground," and particularly mentions, "among other rarities, a hive of bees, so as being hived in glass, you may see the bees making their honey and combs mighty pleasantly." This was the glass hive which had been given to Evelyn at Oxford, by his friend "the universally curious Dr. Wilkins." Evelyn entertained a high opinion of Pepys, who deserved it; but there was much to provoke a smile in his character. His Diary is one of the most amusing books in the language—every thing is natural and warm from the heart. Upon the doctrine of a sermon and the colour of a bonnet, he is equally in earnest.

His scrutiny into the various ornaments of the female costume has the acuteness of an official from a "Magasin des Modes;" he dwells with rapture upon Lady Castlemain's silk scarf, and is particular in committing accurately to paper the intelligence that Mrs. Steward was "very fine with her locks done up with puffs." His own dress was the subject of frequent study and self-congratulation. From the tone of many parts of his diary, the reader would suppose him to have been secretary to the draper's company. Within the brief limits of eight days we find the following important entries:—*July 5, 1660. This morning my brother Thomas brought me my jackanapes coat with silver buttons. July 10. This day I put on my new silk suit, the first that ever I wore in my life. On the 13th we are introduced to a rival of the jackanapes and silk. Up early, the first day that I put on my black camlet cloak with silver buttons.*

He is every thing by turns, and nothing long; one moment we leave him at the bookseller's buying the "New edition of Hooker's Polity;" and in the next line we are astonished to see himself and his wife at the theatre, spectators of the "Silent Woman." Even while alarmed at the successes of the Dutch, he found time to admire the new chariot of Sir William Pen, and declared it the most fashionable yet used by that gentleman. But with all his vanity and trifling minuteness, the gossip of Pepys was the gossip of a gentleman, often, too, redeemed by touches of natural

tenderness, and unpretending piety. He could lie in his comfortable bed in the time of his prosperity, thinking over the period when his poor wife used to make coal fires, and wash his clothes with her own hand "in the little room at my Lord Sandwich's," and not only love her for what she had done, but console himself with the belief that she would do it again, were circumstances to render it necessary. His manners were amiable and endeared him to all his friends. Evelyn says that he was "universally beloved, hospitable, generous, learned in many things, skilled in music, a very great cherisher of learned men of whom he had the conversation."

The old age of Evelyn cannot be described in any language more graceful or touching than Mr. Hone's.

Mr. Evelyn outlived many of his dearest friends; his brothers, his sisters, and all his children, save one, were no more, and the friendships formed in the earlier part of his life were now pretty nearly extinct. Mr. Boyle, "that pious, admirable Christian and excellent philosopher," who "honoured him with his particular esteem for nearly forty years," died in December, 1690. Most of the original members of the Royal Society had left him behind. And among his religious acquaintance, few of those whom he speaks of in terms of affection remained. Bishop Gunning, whose whole character he admired, and Bishop Earle, "a most humble, meek, but cheerful man, an excellent scholar, and rare preacher, universally beloved for his sweet and gentle disposition," by whom Evelyn "had the honour to be loved," had long before him exchanged time for eternity; and more recently Dr. Bathurst died (May 1704,) "the oldest acquaintance," he says, "now left me in the world:" "this," he adds, "is a serious alarm to me; God grant that I may profit by it." His father-in-law, Sir Richard Browne, had been many years gathered to his fathers. The harp of Cowley was silent; and many others whose society he had cultivated for their elegant tastes and accomplishments had gone to give their account.

He had also mourned for the loss of the pious, excellent, and virtuous Lady Mordaunt, "his long acquaintance, a blessed creature, and one that loved and feared God exemplarily." And in the death of another lady he had occasion to lament for "the most excellent and inestimable friend that ever lived." This was Mrs. Godolphin, who died in 1678, at the early age of twenty-six. "Never, he says, was a more virtuous and inviolable friendship; never a more religious, discreet, and admirable creature; beloved of all, admired of all, for all possible perfections of her sex. \* \* How shall I ever repay the obligations to her for the infinite good offices she did my soul, by so oft engaging me

to make religion the terms and tie of the friendship there was between us! we often prayed, visited the sick and miserable, received, read, discoursed, and communicated in all holy offices together. She was most dear to my wife and affectionate to my children. But she is gone! This only is my comfort, that she is happy in Christ, and I shall shortly behold her again."

With so much diligence did this Christian pilgrim trim his lamp, increasing in hope, and joy, and holy delight, as he drew nearer the threshold of his everlasting home. "On entering his eighty-fourth year," says Mr. Hone, "he looked back with thankfulness upon the mercies of God, and particularly expressed his gratitude for his exemption from so many of the sorrows common to old age; he also prayed for pardon of his sins, and for grace to prepare him for a better life." Soon after, on a Sunday when the wet and uncomfortable weather prevented him from attending church, his good friend Dr. Bohun "officiated in the family and made an excellent discourse on 1 Cor. xv. 55, 56,—Of the vanity of this world, and uncertainty of life, and the inexpressible happiness and satisfaction of a holy life, with pertinent inferences to prepare us for death, and a future state." "I gave him thanks," he adds, "and told him I took it kindly as my funeral sermon." But he lived to see two birthdays more, continuing to the very last to number his days so that he may apply them to wisdom, until at length, full of years and full of virtues, he "fell asleep on the 27th of February, 1706," and directed this beautiful aphorism to be inscribed upon his tomb—" *That all is vanity which is not honest, and that there is no solid wisdom but in real piety.*"

In the portrait of Evelyn he is represented holding a copy of his "*Sylva*" in his hand, and it is by this work that his literary fame will be preserved. The "*Sylva*" was originally a paper read before the Royal Society, and Mr. Hone might have added that it was the first book published by that body; its effect upon the popular mind more than realized the most ardent expectations of the author. Mr. Hone has quoted a passage from Wither's "*Emblems*," in which that poet complains of the "havoc and the spoil" then made in every part of the island among the "woods and the groves." Wither was an enthusiast in the admiration of wood scenery, and often took occasion to deplore the destruction of the rich beech-woods of his native village. The desolating civil war, and the consequent anarchy and depression, had contributed to increase the ravages of time and decay. The old forests were rapidly disappearing from the face of the country; Evelyn derived great satisfaction from the success of his work. "Infinitely beyond my expectations," he says in one of his letters, "it has been the occasion of propagating many mil-

lions of useful timber trees throughout this nation, as I may justify without immodesty, from the many letters of acknowledgment received from gentlemen of the first quality, and others altogether strangers to me. His Majesty Charles the Second was sometimes graciously pleased to take notice of it to me, that I had by that book alone, incited a world of planters to repair their broken estates and woods, which the greedy rebels had wasted and made such havoc of."

Evelyn felt like a man who knew himself to be a benefactor of his country. While Britain retains her awful situation among the nations of Europe, remarks Mr. d'Israeli, the *Sylva* of Evelyn will endure with her triumphant oaks. It was an author, he adds, in his studious retreat, who, casting a prophetic eye on the age we live in, secured the late victories of our naval sovereignty. Inquire at the Admiralty how the fleets of Nelson have been constructed, and they can tell you that it was with the oaks which the genius of Evelyn planted.

We must bring these observations to an abrupt conclusion. It will have been seen that we think highly of the volume which has occasioned them. It is gracefully and unassumingly written, and presents in an attractive form the histories of men whose names can only perish with their land's language. If we were inclined to make any objection to the style, we might say in the words of Quarles, that the writer has "imped his wings too much with the church's feathers;" that the diction, to speak more plainly, is too deeply imbued in gospel phraseology. We know that what we may consider a defect will be esteemed by others, and we are willing to conceive, abler judges, a laudable merit. Mr. Hone's taste will be his best guide.

Of the "getting up" of this volume, or of the portraits which adorn it, it is unnecessary to say more than that they are excellent, and reflect great credit upon the publisher.

---

ART. IX. *An Address delivered on laying the first Stone of the New King's Weigh-House, a place of worship intended for the use of a Congregational Church.* By T. Binney. London: Jackson and Walford. 1833.

WITH parties as with armies, in civil as in military affairs, the movements of one side must be partly regulated by the movements of the other. When churchmen, therefore, talk of the conduct proper to be observed with respect to separatists from the Church, the question turns mainly upon this preliminary inquiry, what are the views and intentions, what are the opinions,

and what are the demands, of the Dissenters? Hence with us a fair and authentic account of the principles and feelings of the seceders has long been a *desideratum*. It is here supplied. We may truly say that we have now before us "*dissent delineated*," by a dissenter, in very plain and forcible colours. And we think the more of the picture thus presented, that it is contained not in an elaborate and guarded treatise, but in an occasional "address," thrown off by the impulses of the man, no less than his convictions. It comes fresh from the heart of the individual: and yet it appears, though consisting of but a few pages, in as goodly a quarto shape, as if it had been penned by ten archbishops: and it was spoken on a not unimportant occasion, nor without a certain degree of sanction and authority; for we are told, in an appendix,

"The preceding Address was delivered on the 16th of October last, on laying the first stone of a new place of worship, intended for the congregational church at present assembling in the King's Weigh-House, Little East Cheap, London. An account of the ceremony, as one interesting to Dissenters, appeared in the "*Patriot*," a weekly paper, conducted by members of that body; and a report, substantially correct, was given of much that was spoken by me on that occasion. In consequence of this, I had many applications to publish the Address myself, in a separate form, as it was thought appropriate to the present times, and likely to do good; good, that is, in the estimation of Dissenters."—Appendix, p. 19.

The author's name is T. Binney. We really know not who T. Binney may be; but our readers will perceive that there is a good deal of strength and freedom in his sentiments; and they will find occasionally, we imagine, no inconsiderable share of spirit and power in his manner of delivering them. This opportunity we shall afford them at once, by proceeding to quotations; for our object in the present article is to exhibit *not our own views*, but the views of T. Binney and the sect of which he is the organ: *not what we think of the dissenters, but what the dissenters think of themselves and of the Church*.

The whole address is worthy of attention, as among "the signs of the times;" but the following extracts, we conceive, must be sufficient to "give us pause," and make us seriously consider what our circumstances *are*, and what *should* be our conduct under such circumstances.

"We rejoice," says Mr. Binney, "that we are laying the foundation of a building intended neither for the sacrifices of the temple, nor the services of the synagogue; and that we ourselves are not only delivered from the delusion and vassalage of Gentile superstitions, but that we are raised above whatever distinguished the infancy of the Church, and have



entered into the full possession of the privileges of believers."—Address, pp. 5, 6.

He proceeds to say, and say in very vigorous and emphatic language,

"Our desire is to enjoy the light of the truth ourselves, and our ambition to maintain, to exhibit, and diffuse it. The Bible—the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants ;—the Bible—the whole Bible, is the property of the people. We rejoice that on these principles we can take our stand this day. We are laying the first stone, not of a prison in which truth is to be manacled, nor of a show in which she is to be masked ; but of a palace and a home, where she may emit her splendour and develop her virtues. It is matter of thankfulness that we are delivered from the dominion of the 'Man of Sin ;' that we have nothing to do with the yoke of ignorance, but to endeavour to remove it ; and nothing with the 'word of life' and the lamp of knowledge, but 'to hold them forth.' 'The candle of the Lord' is lighted in our tabernacle, and we have no desire to conceal it by the 'bushel' or the 'bed.' We are free from the usurpation of Antichrist—the imposture and priestcraft of past ages ; and we exult in the thought that we are met this morning to lay the foundation of an edifice sacred to the inculcation of Christian truth, as well as to the exercise of Christian devotion.

"In laying the foundation of a structure, dedicated not only to Christian and Protestant worship, but to worship to be conducted by Protestant dissenters, it becomes us to rejoice, as such, in the liberty which it is at present our privilege to enjoy. There have been periods in the history of our country, when we dared not to have engaged in the public services of this day. It would have been madness to have attempted it. The ceremony would have been a crime punishable by law ; it would have been regarded as an outrage on the constituted order of things, and have been thought an insult equally to the King in heaven and the king upon earth. The fact is, the principle of persecution was formerly common to all sects. The Catholics persecuted the Protestants ; the Protestants the Catholics ; and one class of Protestants another. The rights of conscience and of man were understood and respected by none of them. The nature of religion was misconceived, and the authority of the magistrate misapplied. All the evils of persecution have arisen from the notion, *fundamentally false, but once universally admitted*, that religion is to be established and supported by the State, and the power of the sword used for the extirpation of error, heresy, and schism. This has been the fruitful source of every enormity. *Had Christianity never been allied to the State, persecution never could have existed or prevailed.* Rival sects might have reasoned against or ridiculed each other ; they might have argued or declaimed, exhausted the resources of logic or the vocabulary of reproach : nothing of this kind would have drawn blood ; and, had they dared to draw it by other weapons, the 'powers that be,' and that are 'ordained of God to be the ministers of good,' would have then interposed, in their proper character and legitimate function, to compel them 'to keep the peace,' and to



: punish them for the commission of outrage and violence. All would have been equally protected from the infliction of 'wrong and wicked lewdness;' the magistrate would not have been a judge 'in other matters' beyond his province; and hence persecution, had it thus accidentally appeared, must soon have subsided from the absence of that which is essential to its support. It is only when the contest is unequal, and carried on with other weapons besides reason and argument,—only when one sect is elevated above the rest, and is aided and backed by the civil arm, that persecution is possible or likely to be permanent. The lawfulness and necessity, however, of this aid and alliance, and the vigorous use of the power it conferred, was (*were*) once universally admitted and desired, and hence different sects were each and equally persecutors in their turn. The sufferings of many neither enlightened nor softened them. They oppressed when they had power—they complained when they were oppressed—and when power returned they oppressed again. Among Protestants this was especially the case with the Episcopalians and Presbyterians; and it should never be forgotten, in recollecting the wrongs of our fathers, that the adherents of 'prelacy,' as such, furnished their confessors and martyrs in the days of confiscation, proscription, and blood. The Independents were unquestionably the first who, as a body, advocated a generous and impartial toleration; and if, when in power, they acted inconsistently by excepting 'prelacy and popery,' it should be remembered that it *was* inconsistent—that it was opposed to the wishes of their leaders, and that it was occasioned by the influence of other sects, since they never acted exclusively and alone. To them, under God, we are indebted, as a nation, for whatever of civil or religious liberty we enjoy. We breathe that liberty to-day. Our ecclesiastical ancestors, the founders and fathers of this church, for nearly twenty years after its formation, could only meet for worship in comparative secrecy; it was an object with them to be unobserved; their assembling together was illegal; they were safe only by connivance, for they were deprived of civil security and protection. We rejoice in our altered circumstances. We exult in the thought that we can come forth and lay the foundation of our future sanctuary in the face of day, in the presence of numbers, and under the canopy of heaven. We stand, in many respects, on an equal footing with the rest of the community; and the day *will* come when not a vestige of past oppression shall remain. The principles advocated by our ancestors have been gradually acquiring strength and ascendancy; they are beginning to be universally recognized and diffused. *The truth has gone forth—the fundamental and formidable truth—fundamental as the basis of religious freedom; formidable, from its simplicity, to the mightiest strongholds of religious intolerance; the truth has gone forth,—that the civil magistrate is not appointed of God for the purpose of saving men's souls, but of protecting each equally in saving his own; that his province is not to preside over the church, nor to modify nor manage it; that he is not required to legislate about her doctrines and ceremonies; to determine respectively the true and the becoming; but that, leaving these to be settled by men and by churches for themselves, he is to*

*extend to all the shield of his protection, so long as they entrench not on the rights and liberties of each other, and to exert for any the vigour of his arm, if it can prove that it suffers in either from the usurpation of the rest.*"—pp. 6—8.

The next extract awakens in our own minds, we freely confess, some very acute feelings of pain and regret. There is no spectacle more melancholy than to see members and even ministers of the Church of England flinging at each other the harshest terms, and imputing to each other the most grievous errors and deficiencies, and then dissenters stepping in to take advantage of their mutual accusations.

"The fact is, (speaking without a figure,) that all churches are necessarily exposed to the inroads of error. In spite of acts of parliament, creeds and subscriptions, the *Church of England is the most discordant and divided Christian denomination in the land. The most opposite and conflicting opinions are professed and inculcated by her sons,—by men who have solemnly signed the very same identical declarations.* The clergy are separated into parties; the pretence that uniformity exists among them is a pretence, and nothing more; and every man knows it to be so who has an eye to observe, or an ear to hear, or a head to think; and every such man will admit the assertion, who has honesty to acknowledge what he cannot but perceive. And these differences of opinion are not confined to minor and insignificant matters, but, *upon the showing, and according to the current language of some of the clergy themselves, enter into the very essentials and fundamentals of the faith. Hence it is customary for them to speak of large tracts of the country in which there is only here and there a solitary clergyman who 'preaches the gospel;'* and this man is often represented as despised by his brethren, and persecuted by his neighbours, for his adherence to the truth. Hence, too, we hear of the 'gospel' (the gospel, observe,) being 'introduced' into a place in which it had not been declared for thirty, or fifty, or a hundred years. By such facts, incessantly obtruded on our attention, we are given to understand that *anti-evangelical clergymen* are an overwhelming majority. If any of an opposite character are elevated and dignified, the wonder is announced with triumph and trumpets, and we are thus left to the natural inference that, in the high places of the Establishment, spiritual religion is the exception and not the rule. Among the mass of the body it is said to be the same. And yet these men are patronised and supported as the legal and authorized instructors of the people; the only persons whose orders are valid, and whose ministry is apostolical; and who are therefore regarded with a blind sentiment of veneration and respect. Let this system, then, be contrasted with the history of *anti-evangelical dissent.* A minister of our order becomes a 'denier of fundamental doctrines;' the consequence is, that he is instantly discountenanced and proscribed: he drags on for a while a heartless existence, by the aid of some slender endowment; one by one his attendants retire, till, at length, the sanctuary comes to look like a sepulchre, and is at last converted to some secular use; while, in the

mean time, the active and imperishable principles of our faith spring up under the cultivation of other labourers, and flourish in new and multiplied churches. In the Establishment it is just the contrary. A sort of immortality is conferred on ignorance, imbecility, and error: however dangerous and destructive the doctrines of the minister, he continues to be held up as the legal and legitimate guide of the flock, while the people, perishing and dying, have no power within their own parish to provide themselves with truth on their own principles. The church, though deserted and desolate, stands—stands as a building—the *only authorized provision for instruction and worship, though it presents nothing but the monument and the mockery of both*. The principle of dissent compels the evil to cure itself: the principle of the Establishment perpetuates and protects it. With us the faith flourishes, though the machinery decays; with our brethren *the machinery is preserved at the expense of the faith*. We rejoice this day that the faith of our fathers is among us in its integrity and vigour; we hope to leave it as an inheritance to our children; and we trust they will retain and transmit it inviolate to theirs; but if not, we rejoice in the reflection that the principles of our communion will confer upon others the liberty and the power, without waiting for the leave of civil or ecclesiastical superiors, to fill up the place of our degenerate descendants.”—pp. 9, 10.

Mr. Binney's next *slap* is in the next sentence.

“The structure, of which the first stone has been now laid, will be built and paid for by voluntary contributions. In this circumstance we feel that at all times, but especially in times like these, we are permitted to rejoice with an honest joy. We indulge, this day, feelings of pure and enviable independence. *We build what is intended for ourselves and for our children. We have no power to compel others, who dissent from us as much as we do from them, to build an edifice they would never enter. We trust we have not the will, if we had the power, and that, if the power were offered to be conferred, we should have the virtue to refuse it.*”—p. 10.

The following declarations are at least intelligible, whatever we may think of their candour or their charitableness:

“I know that a proceeding opposite to ours is advocated and enforced on the principle of expediency, a principle which, when properly explained, I recognize and admit. It is said that if a person goes forth ‘armed’ with the principle of an Establishment which is, ‘that all men shall be compelled to build her churches and pay her ministers,’ it is said, that such a person would have his way clear, and that his course would necessarily be short and successful. We admit it. ‘*Armed with all the power of the State, which means, all the strength of its armies, and all the force of its police, and all the terror of its prisons, certainly, such a man might make short work of his mission with a vengeance. It would be the shortest way of filling the land with churches in the length and the breadth of it. But, would it also be the most just, and proper, and becoming? Especially if these structures were reared*

for the exclusive services of one sect, in a nation where the combined numbers of the other sects are probably the majority? Would such a proceeding be not only 'short and successful,' but would it be consistent with the nature of religion, the nature of man, the rights of conscience, and the law of God? No: and I believe that enlightened and purified reason, as possessed either by angels or men, nay, the very bosom of God, the throne and sanctuary of eternal rectitude, echoes the negation. We are acting, this day, on the opposite principle to that which we condemn; and we feel that neither our consciences nor our countrymen can reproach us for what forms the *moral foundation* of the edifice we erect. The sentiments we advocate will one day be universally admitted. They may be summed up in an aphorism like this—one which in its spirit and essence is now traversing the land, and hourly acquiring vigour and ascendancy: '*As in civil affairs, according to the principles of the British constitution, taxation without representation is tyranny, so in religion, compulsory payments to a church from which we conscientiously dissent, is of the nature of persecution; and the exclusive patronage by the State of one sect is injustice.*'"—pp. 11, 12.

It will be seen, that in laying the first stone of the "New King's Weigh-House," (what a strange name for a place of worship,) one object with Mr. Binney and his friends is, to include as many dissenters as possible, and array them as much as possible in opposition to the Church.

"Every teacher who inculcates the fundamentals of the gospel will be welcome to the pulpit, and every disciple who credibly adheres to the same principles will be welcome at the table in that house, the foundation of which is laid this day. The *evangelical Episcopalian*, the orthodox Presbyterian, the individual or personal Baptist, the Methodist, and the Quaker, may each occupy the place of instruction: *we agree in essentials*, and we can welcome, as the servants of the same Lord, all who, with some subordinate peculiarities, equally honour, confide in, and confess him. We will not hold communion either with the world on the one hand, or with the deniers of fundamental truth on the other; but 'all who hold the Head,' and who evince their faith by their works, will receive from us the hand of fellowship and the 'cup of salvation.' 'Grace be with all those who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity.' I should be ashamed if I were laying the foundation of a building in which none could be recognized as teachers or disciples but the ministers and members of one sect. *I could not lift my head in society* if friends and brethren were not only debarred 'the liberty of prophesying,' but were denied the privilege of committing to their father's sepulchre their spiritual children, the members of another communion, but whose family resting-place might be connected with ours. And still more, if the building and the burying-ground were national property, created by taxes levied on the public, and yet restricted to the use of one denomination; *I should experience irrepressible anguish*, if I, in the

circumstances supposed,—I; who might be to the afflicted family an entire stranger, with no knowledge of the dead and no sympathy with the living, if I were compelled to take the place of the minister of the departed, while he stood by, silent and sorrowful, enduring the injury of ecclesiastical insult in addition to that of political injustice.” —p. 14.

So much for his “Address.” In his Appendix, however, T. Binney is at us again. And, first of all, he makes a rather truculent attack upon a man whom we shall not stop either to praise or defend, because he is well able to take care of himself against half a thousand T. Binneys, we mean Dr. Chalmers, who is courteously designated as

“*The Scottish churchman, who practised a sort of fraud on the mixed congregation assembled in Regent Square, by delivering a lecture on establishments instead of a sermon, and who, in the course of it, talked in his usual style about ‘sectarists,’ and ‘sectarians,’ and ‘private adventurers.’*” —p. 19.

Soon afterwards we have T. Binney’s representation of the true *euthanasia* of the Church.

“It is at present universally felt, that the time is at hand when the Establishment must undergo a thorough sifting; the abstract principle on which it rests be discussed in Parliament; and the absolute dissolution of Church and State sought, and perhaps obtained. Dissent and the Establishment will then die together—die on the same day. The terms and things are relative; the end of one will be the termination of both. The day that witnesses this will be a bright and blessed one.” —p. 20.

We have now, probably, quoted enough; some of our readers may think that we have quoted too much, and that we attach a most undue importance to this *tirade* of T. Binney. Certainly, he is not polite; he does not mince matters; but there are many things for which we like him. We like him for the vigorous idiomatic English of his style: we like him for his downright-ness; we like him for the manly and straightforward determination with which he deals his blows. He does not keep us in doubt or in suspense: he tells us at once what we have to expect.

Again, we like him for the honest explicitness of the following avowals:

“Churchmen and dissenters have an equal right to advocate what they respectively approve, and to expose and condemn what they respectively reject. For one sermon or tract published by dissenters in support of dissent, a dozen may be found published by churchmen in support of the Church, published by individuals, voluntarily, or in consequence of episcopal and archidiaconal visitations, and by

the 'Society for promoting Christian Knowledge:' these latter in hundreds and thousands. I have no fault to find with this. I think it right for every man, and every body of men, to endeavour, by all possible means, universally to establish those principles of ecclesiastical polity which they consider to be intimately connected with the purity of the church and the welfare of the world; only let the 'Society' just mentioned be careful that its portraiture of Methodism and dissent display something like 'Christian knowledge,' and not downright heathenish ignorance. Truth cannot be injured by fair and full discussion, and by open and uncompromising statements. I have no hesitation about saying that I am an enemy to the Establishment; and I do not see that a churchman need hesitate to say that he is an enemy to dissent. Neither of us would mean the *persons* of churchmen or dissenters, nor the episcopal or other *portions* of the universal church; but the *principle* of the national religious establishment, which we should respectively regard as deserving, universally, opposition or support. It is with me, I confess, a matter of deep, serious, religious conviction, that the Established Church is a great national evil; that it is an obstacle to the progress of truth and godliness in the land; that it destroys more souls than it saves; and that, therefore, its end is most devoutly to be wished by every lover of God and man. Right or wrong, this is my belief; and I should feel not the slightest offence if a churchman were to express himself to me in precisely the same words with respect to dissent. *We know very well that we do thus actually differ in opinion, and it would be very foolish for either to be offended because the other expresses it. We are bound, each of us, to adopt those principles which we conscientiously consider to be true, and we are equally bound, in proportion to our ability, to defend and diffuse them.*"—p. 20.

With the latter part of these statements we entirely agree; and although we have no leisure at present to measure swords and do battle with T. Binney, we beg to say that we merely reserve the doctrines which he advocates for a very free discussion at some future opportunity, and in the mean time to assure him that it is merely from a very consolatory conviction of the feebleness of his arguments, as compared with the fierceness of his invectives, that we leave him now in the quiet possession of our own field.

It may be also, that we entertain a secret kindness for him; because he alludes with favour to some lucubrations of our own, promulgated in the last number of this review.

"Among recent recommendations, I observe that the Clergy, and the friends of the Church, are told to depend on themselves, and to do two things—'to gain the people,' and 'to use the press.' I think this advice good. The people, the mass of active, intelligent, and reflecting men, that compose the middle classes of the country, are those against whose enlightened opinion nothing in future can be expected to prevail; the



reign of prescription has passed, or is passing. As to the press, its power is immense; and, when properly employed, is laudable and legitimate. It is open to all parties, may be used in a variety of ways, and can adapt itself to all conditions of society, and to all classes of minds."—p. 21.

Yet there may be some treachery in these commendations: for we find them made subservient to the introduction of a most lamentable complaint. T. Binney proceeds:—

"It behoves us, however, to take care that we abuse not this mighty engine of evil and of good. Some of the dutiful sons of the Establishment seem to me to suffer their zeal to get the better of both their honour and their discretion. A printed paper—(the 'friends of the Church' are recommended the vigorous use of the press)—a printed paper, of which the following is a copy, inclosed in a blank cover, has been lately sent to some of the Dissenters of the metropolis; *sent by post, the letters unpaid, the charge ten pence*, the address apparently in the handwriting of a gentleman!

"*'History of Dissent from the Bible, and God's disapproval of it.*

"The Devil was the first Dissenter in heaven.—Where is he now?

"Cain was the first Dissenter on earth.—He slew his brother.

"Corah, Dathan, and Abiram, were Dissenters in the time of Moses.—The earth opened, and swallowed them up.

"Saul, King of Israel, usurped the priest's office, and his kingdom was taken from him."—p. 21.

With more of the same kind: upon which Mr. Binney remarks

"Now, I call this an unfair use of the press, and of the *post* too. The Churchman wields the power, and the Dissenter, *as usual*, is to pay for being insulted. As to the paper itself, it is pure nonsense. It reminds one of the manner of South,—a man of surpassing arrogance and malignity, and may probably be taken from his writings."—p. 22.

We pass by his estimate of South: but, as we spoke of the "*Friends of the Church*," we here assure him that we disclaim *such* friends: not so much out of sympathy, (though we do heartily sympathise) with himself and his brethren for their loss of ten pence a-piece, as out of regard to the Church, which may suffer infinite injury and discredit by the circulation of papers so injudicious and so preposterous in the present aspect of her affairs. We repudiate the miserable trash, for such it is, come from whatever quarter and whatever source it may. We join most cordially with Mr. Binney in declaring—"This is not the way in which *such* questions can be settled."

Even in the passage, with which Mr. Binney closes his appendix, there is much which meets with our entire concurrence: and the whole of it is formed of "stern" and weighty "stuff." Mr. Binney knows, as we know, that a battle is at hand.



“But,” he asks, “what will the battle be about? and between whom will it be fought? It will not be about any particular plan of ecclesiastical reform; for on *whatever it may commence, it will come, I apprehend, to a struggle on the principle itself of an exclusive Establishment.* It will not be between Churchmen and Dissenters; but between both and the legislature, or between them *through* the legislature. *No plan of church reform will ever satisfy either party.* If I were a Churchman, I should contend against any latitudinarian alterations, by which the Establishment should be permitted to continue, but be made large enough to admit all other sects; and, as a Dissenter, I should say, that I have nothing primarily to do with those improvements in the articles or offices of the Church, which her children may regard as important to themselves. On the first supposition, if I found the Government about to adopt such alterations, I should beseech it rather to abandon us entirely, to give us up, to let us alone, to suffer us to become an episcopal sect, with the power and liberty possessed by others, of conducting our own affairs, of regulating our religious matters like religious men, independently of secular control or dictation; and as a Dissenter, I would plainly state, that such supposed alterations are not with us an immediate object, because they would not be to Truth an immediate good. *We wish the entire and absolute dissolution of Church and State; the Establishment, as such, terminated; the episcopal community to become an episcopal denomination, on a perfect equality with every other: then each of them may carry on its own religious reforms for itself, or promote the improvement of the rest by reason and argument; then, all may make such arrangements as they can conscientiously sanction, for the purpose of enjoying mutual communion, without the compromise of principles which they hold to be important.* All sects stand in need of some religious reforms; all may be brought nearer to what a church ought to be than any one of them is at present; but this is their own concern—it is to be done *by* them as churches, and cannot be done *for* them by any secular assembly. All, if placed on a level, would exert an influence, direct or indirect, in promoting the purity and perfection of the rest; and that one, which is now bound, and fettered, and enslaved, would be free to take full and efficient measures for its own. Still more—the question, which is quite distinct from that of establishments, of what kind and degree of aid a government can and may render to Religion, would be discussed with greater likelihood of agreement, when no particular denomination was exclusively patronized or intended to be so. *The dissolution, then of the existing anti-christian ‘alliance’ between Church and State is the object at which Dissenters will aim, and aim at on serious, sacred, religious grounds; identifying it with the honour of God, the peace of his church, and the universal advantage of mankind.* This, however much it may include, is that one thing, which, in the coming conflict, will be sought by them; that which, *whatever else it may ultimately confer, shall, at once and immediately, secure, from the legislature, the extinction of compulsory payments to the Establishment; the opening of the Universities to our youth; an alteration in the law of marriage; and an equal right to the use of the national burying grounds, ‘the place,’ with many of us, ‘of our*

fathers' sepulchres.' The battle so much talked of in every church publication which I have lately seen, will unquestionably come to this. *Every pious and every patriotic man should feel that he is not permitted to be neutral. A judgment must be formed, a side taken, and every legitimate weapon appropriated and employed.*"—pp. 23, 24.

*Et dubitamus adhuc?* Here we have the case of the Dissenters strongly put; here we have the sentiments of the Dissenters unequivocally expressed. The Churchman, who *cannot* see their intentions, is a dolt; the Churchman, who *will not* see their intentions is a traitor. At least, it is not Mr. Binney's fault if any single Churchman remains in the dark. Therefore, we repeat, we feel towards him a kind of regard. We respect an open and uncompromising adversary, in the same proportion as we dislike a timorous, or imprudent, or uncertain friend. Mr. T. Binney fairly throws down the gauntlet, and tells us that, as to the principle of our establishment, the combat shall be "*à l'outrance.*" Very well: we are ready to accept the challenge; and we prefer an antagonist who bears his real device upon his shield.

In fact, that this is the real device of *all*, or very nearly all the Dissenters, we have not the shadow of a doubt. For a time some of them may display a less obnoxious emblazonry: but only for a time. To change the figure slightly, they may sail under other colours; but they will hoist the blood-red flag as soon as the battle begins. Thousands speak in Mr. T. Binney. He appears to us the very impersonation of the genius of Dissent. We may be told of divisions among themselves: we may be told of distinctions between the ancient and the modern Dissenters: between the Independents and the Methodists. But, whatever may be their differences, we verily believe that upon the question of establishment or no establishment they are agreed in their hearts: and that they agree with Mr. Binney. If not, let them state their *disagreement*. If not, let the Wesleyan Methodists, for instance, come out and separate themselves from the cause of which Mr. Binney is a champion: they *must* now see what is wanted by another class of Dissenters, which invites them to its pulpits. Let *them* as plainly and unambiguously announce how far *their* designs and *their* wishes go. If they do not desire the destruction of the established Church, let them declare on what terms they are disposed to re-unite themselves with the established Church. "We pause for a reply."

And we turn again, for a single moment to Churchmen, whether of the Laity or of the Clergy. *They* too must see what, and how extensive, are the demands of the Dissenters; what, and how sanguine, are their hopes and expectations. If their hopes were not sanguine, some of their demands would be kept back.

We have brought before every Churchman the clearest and most unexceptionable testimony, because the testimony of Dissenters themselves; and we have studiously abstained from any intermixture of our own opinions. We have only to add, by way of another *new* quotation, "*Fas est et ab hoste doceri.*" We are assured that the *Dissenters* will not be satisfied with concession and compromise, and "latitudinarian alterations;" that in matters of faith and discipline (for we are not talking about the smaller matters of Church-rates) the Church will not be allowed to keep half by the surrender of the other half, and therefore, that a remodelling of her liturgy and her articles will weaken herself, and make her weakness known, without obtaining the respect or the adhesion, or even the painful and shameful *pity*, of her enemies. Let Mr. Girdlestone and his school lay this to heart; let Lord Henley and *his* school lay *this* to heart; let Archbishop Whateley and *his* school lay this to heart; let,—but we will not introduce other and greater names, until some real ground of suspicion is attached to them.

The *one* question is, are we disposed to give up the establishment, or are we *not*? If we *are*, there are plenty of guides to show us some easy method, according to the last invention which it is hoped will be honoured with his Majesty's *patent* in the spring. But if we are *not*, how shall we best guard and maintain the establishment. We deliberately re-affirm, not by a spurious conciliation, which is only fear; not by a violent intemperance, which is only another kind of fear; but by a resolute and steady assertion of our principles, by a resolute and steady discharge of our duties. Let all the clergy "*preach the Gospel*;" and act as if they believed and felt the gospel; but let not a part of them go about (as Mr. Binney affirms that they go about) complaining that the majority of their brethren in the ministry "*do not preach the Gospel*;" and oftentimes, we believe, merely because the accused parties are not for ever using the watch-words of a peculiar school; or because they cannot advance the whole length which is required in some abstruse and disputed points relating to baptism and regeneration, and election, and grace. Oh! let not the Church be rent and shattered by these deplorable jealousies; nor let terms, which ought never to have been disconnected, be used as terms of hostility and angry alienation; as if a man was less orthodox, because he was evangelical; or less evangelical, because he was orthodox. Or if shades of difference must exist, in doctrine and in manner (nor do we think their existence fatal in itself,) let both parties in the Church only vie in the glorious contention, which shall be most zealous and without reproach in the

sight of God and man : and thus by their words and works appeal to the good sense and the good feeling of the people of England. For ourselves, we are quite contented with Mr. Binney's "*exposé*;" but if our readers want more, we refer them to a pamphlet addressed to the Lord Chancellor, and entitled "*The Case of the Dissenters.*" So much for theory. As a *practical postscript* to the speculations of Mr. Binney, let us just look at the proceedings of a parish meeting at Bishopsgate, reported in the Times newspaper of December 13.

*"Tithes.—Meeting of St. Botolph, Bishopsgate, Parish.—A Vestry Meeting of the Parishioners of the above Parish was held last night at the Parish Church, pursuant to a Requisition numerously signed, for the purpose of Petitioning Parliament for the Repeal of the Local Church Act of that Parish, together with all other Acts respecting Tithes and compulsory payments for the support of the Hierarchy. At six o'clock there were about 300 persons present."*

A Mr. Brown makes a furious speech against a "*State Church,*" and concludes by moving—

*"That as the important questions of Tithes and other ecclesiastical demands will occupy the deliberations of the Legislature, when they re-assemble, we consider it to be our duty, not only on our own behalf, but in unison with the majority of the nation, and for the good of posterity, respectfully to address both Houses of Parliament by petition, humbly representing the injurious consequences which result from the union of an ecclesiastical establishment with the civil government, and praying that our Local Act for raising customary payments in lieu of tithes in this parish, bearing date the 22d of June, 1825, together with all other acts respecting tithes and compulsory payments for the support of the hierarchy, may be repealed: beseeching them not to be satisfied with any modification of the present system, but to take effectual measures for the entire removal of all such imposts, and the disunion of the hierarchy from the civil government."*

This precious motion is seconded by a Mr. Jackson. An amendment is proposed in the following terms:—

*"That it is not expedient to petition Parliament for the repeal of the Local Act of this parish; and that the repeal of all other acts respecting tithes and compulsory payments for the support of the hierarchy, would, in the opinion of this vestry, shake the foundation of all property in the kingdom, and work the most flagrant injustice as between man and man."*

What is the result?

*"The amendment was then put. About twelve or fourteen hands were held up in its support. The original motion was next put, and carried by an immense majority of those in the body of the Church. (All those who had no right to vote had been previously ordered to retire to the gallery, or not to hold up their hands.)"*

"*Body of the Church*"—" *Gallery of the Church*"—and used for purposes such as these. *Quo ruimus?*

Of course we are not responsible for the correctness of the report. With *that* we have nothing to do. We allude to the meeting, because it exhibits the spirit of a certain class, and not because we conceive its deliberations in themselves more important than its constitution was respectable, or its object was reasonable.

Another gentleman, in proposing the next motion, namely, that a petition to both Houses be founded on the foregoing resolution, which was carried, as far as appears, without a dissentient voice, makes a more direct and particular assault upon the specific contract entered into by the rector and the parishioners in the year 1825.

We merely ask, what *are* clergymen to do under such circumstances? They surrender a legal claim: a local act is substituted, by which both parties are to be solemnly bound. To the parishioners this act is itself a *bonus*:—to the rector a pecuniary loss. But the parishioners, whom in the first instance it obviously benefits, are to be bound by it only just so long as it suits their convenience; and when they think they can obtain better terms by an almost bullying ferocity, they turn round upon their own voluntary, nay *solicited*, engagement, and hold such meetings, and such language, as we have just recorded. We do not talk about expediency, or generosity, or charity, in such a case; the words would be too grossly abused: we do not talk about religion, the word would be too lamentably desecrated; but we simply say, where is the common honesty of such conduct?—where is the good old sterling and once English virtue of pecuniary faith? The instance of Bishopsgate is no solitary instance; at Cripplegate, and many other places, the same thing has been tried. The present, however, is a more open and bare-faced attempt at robbery than its predecessors, and marks the progress of the system. No complaint against the individual incumbent is even hinted; and yet, if the prayer of these petitions should be granted, the result might be, that the Rector of Bishopsgate, who must always be a man of distinguished character and acquirements, or he would not be appointed to so important a charge, instead of receiving £2500 per annum, could not be sure of receiving a farthing. It is well that the *brother of the prime minister* has made his escape in time. We do not speak it in any disparagement; but we know enough to know, that *he* would not have been treated with more tenderness or ceremony than the present able, and excellent, and indefatigable rector.

As to any general system to be adopted by the clergy, we say nothing but this—let them do what is right, with this special and

all-important observance, that they do it *because it is right*, and *not* as a *concession*. There is no reason why we should give an imposing and insolent hackney-coachman *less* than his fare, because he demands *more*. But let nothing be given merely as to clamorous exaction, or ruffianly menace. It is the duty of a good citizen, *as a citizen*, to defend the general rights of property in his own person, just as, for the common welfare, he would take prompt measures against any dirty little rascal in the streets, who defiles his pocket while he picks it.

---

ART. X.—*Sermons*. By Henry Melvill, M.A., late Fellow and Tutor of St. Peter's College, Cambridge, and Minister of Camden Chapel, Camberwell. 8vo. London, Rivington, 1833. pp. 379.

WE are very glad to meet with sermons by Mr. Melvill in this legitimate and authorized form. Hitherto we have only seen his name associated, and his discourses mixed up, in the leaves of "The Pulpit," and "The Preacher," with the names and the discourses of sundry "*eminent Divines*"—as they are called by the courtesy of the title-page—whose divinity we question, and whose eminence we have no particular ambition to reach. We have always felt that it was unfair, for many reasons, to judge of Mr. Melvill by the compositions which appeared in any such vehicles of publication. On his account, therefore, and on our own, we hail with pleasure the appearance of this book : and we rejoice to have an opportunity of coming to a definite conclusion upon *data*, quite unimpeachable either in their nature or in their amount.

And yet we hardly know in what light we are to regard Mr. Melvill's sermons, or by what test we are to try them. If we consider them as discourses, like those delivered in the University pulpits, intended for learned and highly educated men, then we must complain of them, for their redundant wordiness, their grievous errors in taste, and the want of purity and chasteness of style which is discernible throughout :—if we consider them as provided for an average congregation, such as a minister of the Church of England usually addresses, we must complain of them, as entering too frequently and too minutely upon points of curious and subtle, if not *rash*, speculation, rather than the plain but ever important topics of Christian truth ; as rather being ambitious displays of the powers of the preacher, than containing the kind of instruction likely to prove most edifying and most valuable in the course of a continued ministration ; but our judgment must, we



suppose, be modified by the consideration, that they were delivered in a proprietary chapel, to a miscellaneous congregation, gathered from no particular locality, and composed of persons, entertaining probably no mean opinion of their religious attainments, and, although in a certain, sense "hungering and thirsting after righteousness," hungering for a food which should be at once the most gratifying and the most stimulating.

Now, as we think that the character of Mr. Melvill's discourses has been affected by the circumstance, that they were delivered in Camden Chapel, and not in the Parish Church, we feel it incumbent upon us to say a few words upon such chapels in general. Let us begin by the most distinct and unequivocal declaration, that we ourselves know many able and excellent ministers attached to proprietary chapels, whom we cannot wish to offend, because we hold them in the highest respect, as indeed we hold Mr. Melvill:—and let us allow, that such chapels were useful and even necessary in many crowded districts, before the grant for building new churches had been made; and, therefore, that it may seem to be a species of ingratitude *now* to turn round upon them and decry them, since new churches have been, or, to a certain extent, can be erected. Let us allow, that such chapels were for many years, in neighbourhoods where the population was rapidly increasing, and the number of inhabited houses was multiplied beyond all former calculation, and that, in some peculiar localities, they still are—the only bulwarks between Dissent, on the one hand, and irreligion on the other. But, nevertheless, we must express our conviction, that their principle is fundamentally and radically bad; and, in many points, absolutely hostile to the principle of an established Church. The position of the ministers is different: the method of their appointment is different: the source of their emolument is different:—and, almost always, they are in a greater degree dependent upon the whims and caprices of the *pew-renters*, than subjected to the discipline of the Church, or amenable to the jurisdiction of any Ecclesiastical superior. Their allegiance is at best divided: they have stronger ties than any which can bind them to the established hierarchy:—nay, they have often a pecuniary interest, directly at variance with the prosperity of the parish church in their neighbourhood. Properly, too, they have no cure of souls: no legitimate sphere for the toilsome but unobtrusive ministrations of the week: and as popularity is for them not merely an advantage, but a *necessity*, they are led to subordinate other duties to a peculiar style of preaching, which may bring around them a large and admiring audience. It is no personal reflection, therefore, upon the proprietors and ministers of such chapels, but an effect



arising from the very nature of things, that they are not Chapels of *ease*, or Chapels of *assistance*, but Chapels of *competition*, and Chapels of *rivalry*. Such at least is the *tendency* of the system; though we cheerfully acknowledge that, from the prevalence of Christian charity counteracting these manifest causes of disunion, it is not always the result.

But, again, what are the facts? The Proprietary Chapels—assuredly not all—but a large proportion of them—go half-way towards Dissent. The Liturgy is nothing; and the discourse is every thing. Long extemporaneous prayers are introduced before the sermon, and after the sermon; a congregation is to be enticed by the attraction of *professional singers*; or popular preachers are brought forward, as if they were theatrical *stars*. Minister after minister must be subjected to the degradation of probationary sermons: and the one, who has, we had almost said, the misfortune to be chosen, too often, instead of standing forth as the ambassador of God, is little more than a dependent creature of the man who built the chapel, or the man who bought it. And even in the case, where the ministers are themselves the proprietors, are they not sometimes compelled to assume a tone either oily or outrageous? Is it not difficult to find any extravagance of doctrine, promulgated of late years, which has not had its origin either in a proprietary chapel, or in an evening Lectureship at a church, of which the principle is very nearly the same?

We speak without reserve: because we speak with reference not to particular places of worship, or particular ministers, whose excellence is in every way unquestioned, but to the entire system and principle of proprietary chapels. We would have them all, if it were possible, done away. We think that the Commissioners for building new churches would do a wise thing, when they have funds, to *buy up* these chapels; taking care that the same ministers should be continued in their office, where they had done their duty zealously and conscientiously as orthodox clergymen of the Church of England: but feeling no very painful solicitude, no very keen compunction, if, where they had departed from it, they were dismissed without ceremony. Of this at least we are sure, that neither the Bishop of any diocese, nor the Rector of any parish, will be excusable, in licensing any new Chapel of the kind, without a thorough knowledge of the minister who is to be appointed, and a perfect security that nothing will be said or done, except in strict and literal conformity with the doctrines and discipline of the Established Church.

But we return to Mr. Melvill:—and we should owe him an apology, if any of our readers could suppose that, in mixing up a discussion of proprietary chapels with a review of his discourses,

we deemed him in any way part or parcel of the evils which we have deprecated. Our only feelings, with regard to him, upon the subject are, a feeling of regret, that such a man should be attached to the excrescence, rather than the trunk of the Establishment; and a feeling of conviction, that the character of his publication has been materially deteriorated by the nature of the station which he occupies. Hence, probably, it is, that the twelve addresses before us are hardly so much regular *sermons* as rhetorical exercises, or declamatory harangues. Sometimes, indeed, we cannot help suspecting that into these twelve discourses has been heaped the substance of many others: and thus, perhaps, we may account for their *lengthiness* (to borrow an Americanism), and also for the circumstance, that they are crowded, and occasionally confused. If such be the fact, it is to be lamented: for the sermons would have been better; if the matter and the imagery had been spread over a larger number of divisions, and they had been printed more as Mr. Melvill originally preached them. We proceed, however, to examine them simply upon the ground of their merits as they stand. At the same time we beg to say, that our examination will turn rather upon their literary than their theological or doctrinal peculiarities;—not, assuredly, because we conceive, in common cases, that the literary peculiarities of a sermon are of half so much importance as the theological; but partly because some other incidental topics may be introduced with benefit; and partly because Mr. Melvill's theology is by most persons less considered than his eloquence, and he fills a space in the public eye more as a preacher than as a divine. Of course, however, in forming our general estimate, we shall take *both* the elements of matter and style into our impartial and unbiassed consideration.

Mr. Melvill is, without question, a man of remarkable talent. He possesses reasoning powers of a high order, blended with an imaginative faculty, always alive and always vigorous. If taste and judgment were bestowed upon him in an equal degree, there are very few men of the day whom he might not throw quite into the shade. Mr. Melvill is also reputed to be the most popular preacher of his time in England, and popular in a better sense of the term than when it is applied to the generality of *insinuating* or *fanatic* spouters, who *rant* or *wheelde* for their hour in a fashionable chapel, or a church famous for strong doctrine. Nor is it possible to take up the volume before us without tracing evidences of the diversified endowments of the writer. Many of its pages sparkle with the flashes of real genius: there are, in every one of its sermons, many ingenious, and some profound observations; much of striking metaphor, much of vivid delineation;

many passages of singular force, many touches of true and deep tenderness, many bursts of the most earnest and energetic appeal. But (what a pity it is that the word *but* is necessary) these capital distinctions are marred and counterbalanced by a considerable quantity of faults; although it is a circumstance of happy augury for Mr. Melvill's future career, that they are all of them faults of superfluity, and none of them faults of deficiency. Mr. Melvill never knows when he has said enough, or when he has worked up an image to a pitch sufficiently exalted. In the ascent of his conceptions, he heaps Pelion upon Ossa, until at last he fairly reaches into the clouds. The most obvious drawbacks upon the value of Mr. Melvill's discourses, are a perpetual mannerism, which sometimes degenerates almost into affectation—an excessive verbiage, and a not unfrequent repetition of himself—an utter absence of simplicity and repose, together with a tone of thought almost always upon the verge of enthusiasm, and a tone of language almost always upon the verge of extravagance. It has been said that there is only a step between the sublime and the ridiculous: and yet, in some places, Mr. Melvill manages to hover between the two, without absolutely touching either the one or the other.

We had intended to enumerate among his faults a too close similitude to Dr. Chalmers; but, upon reflection, we will not attempt to strip a man like Mr. Melvill of the praise of originality, although the resemblance is oftentimes discernible upon the most rapid and careless glance: and we really believe that Mr. Melvill has so impregnated his mind with the eloquence of Dr. Chalmers, that he has borrowed many of his phrases and turns of expression, without even being sensible of the appropriation. The topic, however, may seem invidious; and we shall only add our regret that Mr. Melvill, instead of forming himself at all upon the pattern of Dr. Chalmers, had not consulted some of the more ancient models, or studied, day and night, the manner of Robert Hall.

But our readers will not thank us for allegations without proof, whether laudatory or disparaging. We hasten then to make a few extracts, premising that we have chiefly selected them from the more laboured and ornate, and therefore the more characteristic, portions of the volume. For Mr. Melvill's more *level* style certainly does not appear to us to be marked by any peculiar feature of terseness or elegance; and his force is mainly thrown either into the peroration of the whole discourse, or the close of the several departments into which his subject is divided.

The first sermon is entitled "The First Prophecy," and is, perhaps, chiefly conspicuous in certain parts for the *adventurous*-

ness, if the term is legitimate, with which Mr. Melvill soars into the misty and barren regions, where nothing but doubt and disagreement can grow; or dashes upon points not absolutely essential to the faith and conduct of a Christian, but involved in intricacies and obscurities which no industry can hope to unravel in the present state of our finite comprehension. There is also an occasional leaning, we think, to the *fanciful* rather than the *practical*; as for instance:—

“The words, indeed, of our text have a primary application to the serpent. It is most strictly true, that ever since the fall, there has been enmity between man and the serpent. Every man will instinctively recoil at the sight of a serpent. We have a natural and unconquerable aversion from this tribe of living things, which we feel not in respect to others, even fiercer and more noxious. Men, if they find a serpent, will always strive to destroy it, bruising the head in which the poison lies; whilst the serpent will often avenge itself, wounding its assailant, if not mortally, yet so as to make it true that it bruises his heel.”—pp. 2, 3.

Now they who dislike serpents, simply in proportion as they are really hurtful and venomous; and they, who themselves, perhaps, would shudder quite as much at a rat, or a toad, or a spider, may question the unqualified assertion in the former part of this extract; and almost all, we imagine, will feel that there is something forced and far-fetched in the attempt, in the latter part, to press a *close* and *literal* construction of the prophecy.

The same remarks might apply to much of the *second* sermon, which is called “Christ the Minister of the Church.” How *odd*, for instance, must the annexed passage sound to many ears.

“But if a sermon differ from what a *gospel sermon* should be, men will determine that Christ could have had nothing to do with its delivery. Now this, we assert, is nothing less than the deposing Christ from the ministry assigned him by our text. We are far enough from declaring that the Chief Minister puts the false words into the mouth of the inferior. But we are certain, as upon a truth, which to deny is to assault the foundations of Christianity, that the Chief Minister is so mindful of his office, that every man who listens in faith, expecting a message from above, shall be addressed through the mouth, aye, even through the mistakes and errors, of the inferior. And in upholding this truth—a truth attested by the experience of numbers—we simply contend for the accuracy of that description of Christ which is under review. If, wheresoever the minister is himself deficient and untaught, so that his sermons exhibit a wrong system of doctrine, you will not allow that Christ's Church may be profited by the ordinance of preaching, you clearly argue that the Redeemer has given up his office, and that he can no longer be styled the ‘Minister of the true Tabernacle.’ There is no middle course between denying that Christ is the minister, and allowing that, whatever the faulty statements of his ordained servant, no soul

which is hearkening in faith for a word of counsel or comfort, shall find the ordinance worthless, and be sent away empty."—pp. 46, 47.

On this, too, as well as on other grounds, we might dilate upon the *fourth* sermon, which is upon "The Humiliation of the Man Christ Jesus:" but the following quotation must suffice to elucidate our meaning.

"We would pause for a moment in our argument, and speak on the point of the Saviour's humanity. We are told that Christ's humanity was in every respect the same as our own humanity; fallen, therefore, as ours is fallen. But Christ, as not being one of the natural descendants of Adam, was not included in the covenant made with, and violated by, our common forefather. Hence his humanity was the solitary exception, the only humanity which became not fallen humanity as a consequence on Adam's apostasy. If a man be a fallen man, he must have fallen in Adam; in other words, he must be one of those whom Adam federally represented. But Christ, as being emphatically the seed of the woman, was not thus federally represented; and therefore Christ fell not, as we fell, in Adam. He had not been a party to the broken covenant, and thus could not be a sharer in the guilty consequences of the infraction.

"But, nevertheless, whilst we argue that Christ was not what is termed a fallen man, we contend that, since 'made of a woman,' he was as truly 'man, of the substance of his mother,' as any one amongst ourselves, the weakest and most sinful. He was 'made of a woman,' and not a new creation, like Adam in Paradise. When we say that Christ's humanity was unfallen, we are far enough from saying that his humanity was the same as that of Adam before Adam transgressed. He took humanity with all those innocent infirmities, but without any of those sinful propensities, which the fall entailed. There are consequences on guilt which are perfectly guiltless. Sin introduced pain, but pain itself is not sin. And therefore Christ, as being 'man, of the substance of his mother,' derived from her a suffering humanity; but, as 'conceived by the Holy Ghost,' he did not derive a sinful. Fallen humanity denotes a humanity which has descended from a state of moral purity to one of moral impurity. And so long as there has not been this descent, humanity may remain unfallen, and yet pass from physical strength to physical weakness. This is exactly what we hold on the humanity of the Son of God. We do not assert that Christ's humanity was the Adamic humanity; the humanity, that is, of Adam whilst still loyal to Jehovah. Had this humanity been reproduced, there must have been an act of creation; whereas, beyond controversy, Christ was 'made of a woman,' and not created, like Adam, by an act of omnipotence."—pp. 112, 113.

Mr. Melvill then proceeds to present the same ideas in a variety of other shapes, through which we have not room to follow him; but we cannot forbear to hint, that there are several things, both in the *physics* and *metaphysics* of this description, against which an infidel might cavil with some show of justice and

triumph; and that the endeavour thus to clear up the mysteries of our Redeemer's humanity is altogether unsafe—is to be wise beyond what is written—and raises more difficulties than it can ever explain.

Nevertheless, there are magnificent fragments in both these sermons, which hardly any one but Mr. Melvill could have written. And the same may be said of the sermons on "The Doctrine of the Resurrection," and on "The Power of Religion to strengthen the Human Intellect," and on "The Truth as it is in Jesus," and on "The Difficulties of Scripture;" and, indeed, in every one of the twelve sermons which the volume contains.

But, not the less, in every one of the twelve are to be found some, or all, of the faults and drawbacks which we have already enumerated. And so curiously are the faults and beauties intermixed, that we find it almost impossible to disentangle them, and give separate specimens of each. We come to a passage of cogent reasoning, or nervous expression; but it is almost immediately disfigured by the intrusion of some extravagance: we would point out a passage as full of extravagance, but presently we discover imbedded in it some precious stone of brilliant thought or splendid diction. The best and the worst of Mr. Melvill often come together, and are in the strictest *juxta-position*.

The following, in a sermon on "The Power of Wickedness to reproduce itself," although it presents nothing very novel in sentiment, is composed in Mr. Melvill's best style:—

"We are searching for an identity or sameness between what is sown and what is reaped. We, therefore, yet further observe, that it may not be needful that a material rack should be prepared for the body, and fiery spirits gnaw upon the soul. It may not be needful that the Creator should appoint distinct and extraneous arrangements for torture. Let what we call the husbandry of wickedness go forward; let the sinner reap what the sinner has sown; and there is a harvest of anguish for ever to be gathered. Who discerns not that punishment may thus be sinfulness, and that, therefore, the principle of our text may hold good, to the very letter, in a scene of retribution? A man 'sows to the flesh;' this is the Apostle's description of sinfulness. He is 'of the flesh to reap corruption;' this is his description of punishment. He 'sows to the flesh' by pampering the lusts of the flesh; and he 'reaps of the flesh,' when these pampered lusts fall on him with fresh cravings, and demand of him fresh gratifications. But suppose this reaping continued in the next life, and is not the man mowing down a harvest of agony? Let all those passions and desires which it has been the man's business upon earth to indulge, hunger and thirst for gratification hereafter, and will ye seek elsewhere for the parched tongue beseeching fruitlessly one drop of water? Let the envious man keep his envy, and the jealous man his jealousy, and the revengeful man his revengefulness; and each has a worm which will eat out everlastingly the very core of his soul. Let



the miser have still his thoughts upon gold, and the drunkard his upon the wine-cup, and the sensualist his upon voluptuousness; and a fire-sheet is round each which shall never be extinguished. We know not whether it be possible to conjure up a more terrific image of a lost man than by supposing him everlastingly preyed upon by the master-lust which has here held him in bondage. We think that you have before you the spectacle of a being, hunted, as it were, by a never-wearied fiend, when you imagine that there rages in the licentious and profligate, only wrought into a fury which has no parallel upon earth, that very passion which it was the concern of a life-time to indulge, but which it must now be the employment of an eternity to deny. We are persuaded that you reach the summit of all that is tremendous in conception, when you suppose a man consigned to the tyranny of a lust which cannot be conquered, and which cannot be gratified. It is, literally, surrendering him to a worm which dies not—to a fire which is quenched not. And whilst the lust does the part of a ceaseless tormentor, the man, unable longer to indulge it, will writhe in remorse at having endowed it with sovereignty; and thus there will go on (though not in our power to conceive, and, O God, grant it may never be our lot to experience) the cravings of passion with the self-reproachings of the soul; and the torn and tossed creature shall for ever long to gratify lust, and for ever bewail his madness in gratifying it."—pp. 175—177.

Again, in the next sermon:—

"We shall assert that the moral improvement is just calculated to bring about an intellectual. You all know how intimately mind and body are associated. One plays wonderfully on the other, so that disease of body may often be traced to gloom of mind, and, conversely, gloom of mind be proved to originate in disease of body. And if there be this close connection between mental and corporeal, shall we suppose there is none between mental and moral? On the contrary, it is clear that the association, as before hinted, is of the strictest. What an influence do the passions exercise upon the judgment! How is the voice of reason drowned in the cry of impetuous desires! To what absurdities will the understanding give assent, when the will has resolved to take up their advocacy! How little way can truth make with the intellect, when there is something in its character which opposes the inclination! And what do we infer from these undeniable facts? Simply, that whilst the moral functions are disordered, so likewise must be the mental. Simply, that so long as the heart is depraved and disturbed, the mind, in a certain degree, must itself be out of joint. And if you would give the mind fair play, there must be applied straightways a corrective process to the heart. You cannot tell what a man's understanding is, so long as he continues 'dead in trespasses and sins.' There is a mountain upon it. It is tyrannized over by lusts and passions, and affections and appetites. It is compelled to form wrong estimates, and to arrive at wrong conclusions. It is not allowed to receive as truth what the carnal nature has an interest in rejecting as falsehood."—pp. 206, 207.

We would also quote with pleasure, if we had space, several



passages from a sermon on "The Impossibility of Creature Merit;" which errs, however, we think, in sometimes taking a line of argument which might be used to prove the impossibility of creature *demerit*.

But Mr. Melvill himself is not contented with this manner of writing: he is always straining after an eloquence far more transcendent; and what is worse, his fame, we apprehend, is most built upon the extraordinary effusions, in which truth and sobriety are sacrificed to startling language and exaggerated conceits.

What will the reader think of such oratory as the following? Must not the judicious grieve? and will not the scorner be tempted to smile?

"We wish you to understand thoroughly the nature of Christ's intercession. *When Rome had thrown from her the warrior who had led his countrymen to victory, and galled and fretted the proud spirit of her boldest hero; he, driven onwards by the demon of revenge, gave himself as a leader where he had before been a conqueror, and, taking a hostile banner into his passionate grasp, headed the foes who sought to subjugate the land of his nativity. Ye remember, it may be, how intercession saved the city. The mother bowed before the son; and Coriolanus, vanquished by tears, subdued by plaints, left the Capitol unscathed by battle.* Here is a precise instance of what men count successful intercession. But there is no analogy between this intercession and the intercession of Christ. Christ intercedes with justice. But the intercession is *the throwing down his cross on the crystal floor of heaven*, and thus proffering his atonement to satisfy the demand. Oh, it is not the intercession of burning tears, nor of half-choked utterance, nor of thrilling speech. It is the intercession of a broken body, and of gushing blood; of death, of passion, of obedience. It is the intercession of a *giant leaping into the gap, and filling it with his colossal stature, and covering, as with a rampart of flesh, the defenceless camp of the outcasts.* So that, not by the touching words and gestures of supplication, but by the resistless deeds and victories of Calvary, the Captain of our salvation intercedes—pleading, not as a petitioner who would move compassion, but rather as a conqueror who would claim his trophies."—pp. 50, 51.

"Of all the boons which God has bestowed on this apostate and orphaned creation, we are bound to say that the Bible is the noblest and most precious. We bring not into comparison with this illustrious donation the glorious sun-light, nor the rich sustenance which is poured forth from the storehouses of the earth, nor that existence itself which allows us, though dust, to soar into companionship with angels. The Bible is the development of man's immortality, the guide which informs him how he may move off triumphantly from a contracted and temporary scene, and grasp destinies of unbounded splendour, eternity his life-time, and infinity his home. It is the record which tells us that this rebellious section of God's unlimited empire is not excluded from our Maker's compassions; but that the creatures who move upon its surface, though they have basely sepulchred in sinfulness and corruption the magnifi-

cence of their nature, are yet so dear in their ruin to Him who first formed them, that he hath bowed down the heavens in order to open their graves. Oh! you have only to think what a change would pass on the aspect of our race, if the Bible were suddenly withdrawn, and all remembrance of it swept away, and you arrive at some faint notion of the worth of the volume. Take from Christendom the Bible, and you have taken the moral chart by which alone its population can be guided. Ignorant of the nature of God, and only guessing at their own immortality, the tens of thousands would be as mariners, tossed on a wide ocean, without a pole-star, and without a compass. *The blue lights of the storm-fiend would burn ever in the shrouds; and when the tornado of death rushed across the waters, there would be heard nothing but the shriek of the terrified, and the groan of the despairing.* It were to mantle the earth with a more than Egyptian darkness; it were to dry up the fountains of human happiness; it were to take the tides from our waters, and leave them stagnant—and the stars from our heavens, and leave them in sack-cloth—and the verdure from our vallies, and leave them in barrenness; it were to make the present all recklessness and the future all hopelessness, *the maniac's revelry, and then the fiend's imprisonment,* if you could annihilate that precious volume which tells us of God and of Christ, and unveils immortality, and instructs in duty, and woos to glory. Such is the Bible. Prize ye it, and study it more and more. Prize it, as ye are immortal beings—for it guides to the New Jerusalem. Prize it, as ye are intellectual beings—for it 'giveth understanding to the simple.'"—pp. 210—212.

In these passages, how much of vigour is worse than marred! how much of talent is worse than thrown away! And yet we firmly believe, that, when delivered with a rapid energy of voice and gesture, they would strike hundreds of an arrested audience as glorious exhibitions and even master-pieces of eloquence. Nor, perhaps, will the mischief rest here. We assuredly are of opinion, that in these extracts Mr. Melvill has at least reached the *high-water* mark of pulpit oratory; but we are in sad alarm that others will seek to ascend to a yet farther point, until a torrent of fine words overflows every boundary of discretion, and moderation, and common sense. To this point, however, we shall return.

Let us here only enter our protest by saying, that the style of the foregoing quotations is bad in itself, because it must distract the thoughts of a congregation from the main argument or doctrine of a sermon to the crowd and confusion of metaphors, with which it is studded:—and most mischievous, as a precedent, because it must encourage young but ambitious preachers to swell out old and common ideas, as if they were great and wonderful discoveries,—and, we might almost add, trick out the figure of religion in a tawdry and tinsel robe, which might better become a strolling actress.

Mr. Melvill should really be *above* a style, which, in plain truth, being itself far beyond the limits of true eloquence, will induce many to rush into downright *fustian*:—a style, which is not *tragic*, but *melodramatic*;—which resembles not the pure and classical drawings of Raphael or Correggio, but the wildest exaggerations of Martin or Fuseli.

Unfortunately, we might go on; and quote other "*dulcia vitia*," other shining sins of compositions, which can only serve as "lights to lure astray." We might remark the *iteration* of particular words and phrases; the evidences of a strain and *tension*, which, we fear, will exhaust both mind and body in no long period: the constant recurrence to "angelic harpings and melodizings," and the proximity of the end of the world; the coinage—or, at least, the introduction into *theological prose*—of such terms as "*snow-mountains*," for mountains covered with snow; and "*wur-tug*," and "*forefront*," and "*poison-cup*," and "*wrath-cup*," with sundry others, which ought rather to be left to the poetical department of the "*Annals*." Nor can we omit to notice the strange and grating incongruity of the passages which we shall next quote, or the mixture of grandeur and *bizarrerie*, with which we shall close our extracts.

"We are persuaded that if there be one thing on this earth which, more than another, draws the *sorrowing regards of the world of spirits*, it must be the system of education pursued by the generality of parents. *The entering a room gracefully is a vast deal more attended to than the entering into heaven; and you would conclude that the grand thing for which God had sent the child into the world, was that it might catch the Italian accent, and be quite at home in every note of the gamut.*"  
—p. 213.

"The voice of righteousness will find something of an echo amid the disorders and confusions of the worst moral chaos; and the strings of conscience are scarcely ever so dislocated and torn as not to yield even a whisper, when swept by the hand of a high-virtued monitor."  
—p. 289.

"The main thing wanted, in order that men might be assured of immortality, was a grappling with death. It was the showing that there should be no lasting separation between soul and body. It was the exhibiting the sepulchres emptied of their vast population, and giving up the dust remoulded into human shape. And this it was which the Mediator effected, not so much by announcement as by action, not so much by preaching resurrection and life, as by being 'the resurrection and the life.' He went down to the grave in the weakness of humanity, but, at the same time, in the might of Deity. And, designing to pour forth a torrent of lustre on the life, the everlasting life of man, oh, he did not bid the firmament cleave asunder, and the constellations of eternity shine out in their majesties, and

dazzle and blind an overawed creation. *He rose up, a moral giant, from his grave-clothes; and, proving death vanquished in his own stronghold, left the vacant sepulchre as a centre of light to the dwellers on this planet. He took not the suns and systems which crowd immensity in order to form one brilliant cataract which, rushing down in its glories, might sweep away darkness from the benighted race of the apostate. But he came forth from the tomb, masterful and victorious; and the place where he had lain became the focus of the rays of the long-hidden truth; and the fragments of his grave-stone were the stars from which flashed the immortality of man.*—pp. 146, 147.

We cannot end with a fairer specimen of both the power and the false taste, by which Mr. Melvill is distinguished. And, if the power had not belonged to him, we should have been at no trouble to utter a warning against the false taste. It is his *beauties*, which render him dangerous; somewhat as Cæsar's good qualities caused his tyranny to be borne, and it was said with some reason,

“Curse on his *virtues*, they've undone his country.”

We would not do Mr. Melvill injustice; and at moments, when we take up the volume again, and light upon some glowing thought felicitously managed, some happy image attractive through the drapery of words, which flows around it, we are almost ready to accuse ourselves of harshness; but we are not disarmed long; we gather a fresh access of rigour from the reflection, how much injury the general adoption of such a manner in our churches would inflict upon the literature, and ultimately, we apprehend, upon the religion of the land. Mr. Melvill is himself far too poetical for prose; and far too laboriously gorgeous for the pulpit; but we come now more systematically to inquire, what effect his success is likely to produce, at a time, when there are already too many temptations, instead of making sermons local and peculiar to the wants of a congregation, to pronounce something suitable to the next number of some three-penny periodical, almost as speeches in the House of Commons are addressed most to the reporters.

We gravely ask, then, at what point are we to stop? What is to become of us, if a style such as this becomes the standard of the most approved composition? What is to become of us, if men of inferior understanding imitate this style, with the intention and the ambition of surpassing it? What, if the next orator should be to Mr. Melvill, what Mr. Melvill is to Dr. Chalmers; and a similar rate of proportion should go on almost “*ad infinitum*.” We fear that both our prose and our verse are verging fast towards this tumid inflation. As to verse

we have a specimen now afforded us by the egregious Mr. Wall: as to prose, we might mention many young aspirants, senatorial, legal, and clerical, whose nascent glories are only just mounting above the line of the horizon. Men are so bespangling the texture of their lucubrations, that we can hardly discern the colour of the ground; they are dissatisfied, till all is effort, and brilliancy, and exaggeration: instead of merely interspersing their illustrations to explain the ideas, they rather lead up the ideas to the illustrations; and they squeeze in a whole sentence for the glorious purpose of introducing a trope. Alas! the ardent spirits, who are debarred from flinging themselves into the arms of poetry, because the muse is out of favour, are only the more likely to make our "*prose run mad*."

What is the consequence? The march of the thoughts is prolix and tedious; and they grapple but feebly with their subject, like a Persian army incumbered with a long train of baggage, and weakened by the costly adornments of luxury or ostentation. Or rather,—for this comparison is much too magnificent,—the puny and pilfered conceptions are dressed up in an array of words infinitely too big for them; until they look like a frolicsome child, endeavouring to walk about and look important in a heavy great coat belonging to his grandfather.

But we must stop, for our own remarks may prove how infectious is this style. We feel, indeed, that we have well nigh caught the contagion, fresh as we are,—not merely from the perusal of Mr. Melvill's Sermons,—but from some other bursts of oratory, which were designed, we imagine, to transport all the hearers into the seventh heaven.

The fact is, that, in reviewing the sermons before us, we almost feel, as if we were reviewing a new *class* of writers and preachers, of whom Mr. Melvill is at once the representative and the Coryphæus. We mean the class of men, whose prose can hardly be called "*sermo pedestris*;" for it is always walking upon stilts. We feel also, that it will be well, if it is possible, to stop this irregular kind of Pegasus, before it is put to the impetus of its full speed. The very principle of such a manner of composition, if it be suffered to proceed much farther, will become quite intolerable; and, if used in the pulpit, instead of inspiring a solemn awe, or awakening calm, but serious reflection, will only tickle the ear, and play round the fancy; but no more restrain the guilty, or console the declining, than we could feed a starving man upon artificial roses.

Unfortunately, the great magnet is excitement; the great secret is to produce excitement; and the more stirring the excitement, the more overflowing the audience. There is the

fiercer excitement, which inflames man's emotions; there is the softer excitement, which steals upon female sensibilities. Stimulate the imagination, work upon the feelings, nay, even agitate the senses, simply the eye and ear, by loud tones and vehement gestures; and the work is done. But, then, again, as the understanding is much less excitable than the imagination or the passions, the appeals to the understanding, in popular preaching, are comparatively few, and far between. True eloquence,—the eloquence, which, in its resistless sweep, carries along with it the intellect and the emotions together, is a glorious and a divine thing; and perhaps it has been rightly accounted, by a most competent judge, to be the very rarest of all human acquirements. But a false and specious eloquence will do quite as well, if the only aim is to attract a numerous congregation, by acting upon the excitability of man or woman.

True eloquence, is, of all conceivable things, perhaps the most distant from the sort of oratory to which we allude. It is severe, and simple, and unaffected. It is always rapid, and always direct, because always in earnest. It invariably chooses the most obvious and forcible, rather than the finest terms. It sternly discards all superfluity and excess; it scorns and tramples upon meretricious pomp. It is sometimes figurative, because figures will sometimes convey the clearest representation of the truths which it wishes to impress; but it is seldom distinguished by *much* of mere imagery or embellishment. It glows with its own velocity. Every thing, that is far-fetched, thwarts its effect: every thing is foreign to its purpose, which distracts the mind from the one subject on which it is to be kept intent. In true eloquence, the logic and the rhetoric are one. It burns, and thunders, and lightens, as it would convince and persuade. Its best art is to be above all artifices, and tricks, and mannerism whatsoever. If metaphors and comparisons lie in its line of march, it will bear them onward, and make use of them: but it will not pause, or deviate, to pick them up, more than a man hurrying on an important errand would step out of his way to gather flowers. Such is the best, because the most natural eloquence; and the intellectual taste of a nation is always vitiated and debauched, when such eloquence is but faintly admired, whether it be in the pulpit, or in the senate, or at the bar; or when the more florid, and Asiatic, and exuberant class of oratory is preferred to it.

This style is much more solicitous about things than words; this style compels a man to pay attention to his matter; for it is just the style, in which no man can venture to talk *trash*. Sophistry and imbecility always like to clothe themselves with an



unmeaning cloud of words. Compressed into this style, an hour's worth of a popular harangue would hardly occupy ten minutes.

Could Mr. Melvill's publication bear to be tried by such a criterion as this? and yet he must be as well aware as we are, that it requires more mastery of thought to present the *one* right idea, than a dozen almost right; that it requires more mastery of language to choose one word, and that the best, than to pour out an affluent tautology in the indiscriminate heap of expletives and synonymes. He must be aware also, that a vicious style once indulged must almost inevitably become more and more vicious: because it first spoils the intellectual palate of an audience, and then is obliged to *spice and pepper* more and more, in order to satisfy the palate, which it has helped to spoil.

But let us stop once more to qualify what we advance. These remarks are adapted, and they are meant, not *half* so much for Mr. Melvill, as for the present or the *embryo* imitators of Mr. Melvill.

We know well, that there is no limit to the extravagance of *imitators*: and we suspect, from symptoms already manifested, that if the *cacoëthes*, not merely of writing, but of fine writing, fairly seizes upon the rising generation, the forth-coming crop of absurdities will be luxuriant indeed. Peter Pindar's description of Sir Joseph's pursuit of a butterfly, will seem tame and cold to their heat and anxiety in the chace of a metaphor. More and more astounding will become the displays of grotesque embroidery, and puerile amplification; until at last perhaps we shall have young gentlemen entering upon the most common-place pursuits with "a *staunch and dominant* step," and shaving their chins with the "*machinery*" of a razor, and applying to their coats the "*apparatus*" of a brush.

But we repeat,—for we must always keep in mind—the great misfortune is, that a style, redolent of pleonasms and vagaries, while it is only ludicrous and amusing on other subjects, tends to very serious mischief, when addressed from the pulpit, and introduced into religious compositions. It injures not only the preacher, but the hearers. Men, and women still more, will be perpetually on the look out for splendid diction, and glittering images, and vehement delivery; they will think less of the truths of the Gospel, than of the garb in which they are clothed, and the *manner* in which they are set forth: and they will scarcely listen to homely unadorned sense spoken with a plain unpretending simplicity. But these things are much to be deplored; for it would be no small calamity to the devotion of a country, if even a single Church or Chapel were frequented, less as a place of pious and humble



worship, than as an arena for declamation, or a theatre, where the feelings were to be moved.

We are quite ready to allow, that many orthodox ministers err, *and by design*, in the opposite extreme. They destroy their efficiency by studiously subduing their style, and being as elaborately bare and frigid, as their far more successful rivals are elaborately gorgeous and impassioned. After all, in nineteen cases out of twenty, a man's natural style will be the most useful and become him best. We mean the style, to which he is led by his peculiar constitution of taste and temperament; where he neither chills himself down into an artificial iciness, nor heats himself into an artificial inspiration, which is the *afflatus* of vanity, and not of religion.

It may seem scarcely candid, that we should append all these remarks to a criticism upon Mr. Melvill's discourses. And yet we are paying him a compliment. If we entertained a less high opinion of his abilities and his influence, we should have dismissed his volume with a very brief and cursory notice. But, although we may think him an example, in many respects "*vitiis imitabile*," we feel that he has a power about him which is sure to make him an example. His very faults are set off by so much that is really forcible and really beautiful, that we have been sometimes captivated by them ourselves, until our calmer judgment has had time to operate; and, very possibly, if we had heard these sermons, instead of reading and weighing them at our leisure, we might have gone away with an impression of almost unqualified admiration. In a word, if a style of flowery luxuriance, and oppressive copiousness, gradually creeps into our pulpits, and becomes the favorite style of the day, Mr. Melvill, we believe, will have more to answer for, than any other man in his majesty's dominions, with the exception of Dr. Chalmers. We have, in fact, had several opportunities of ascertaining that from his celebrity and his talents, he has already *become* a model. We have known his *pet* expressions transplanted into the sermons of several preachers, studious of popularity, and, we dare say, on the high road to its attainment; nay, we have known them in two or three instances stuck, like the purple patches, upon a thread-bare poverty of thought and language; and so forming a mixture, according to the light in which the matter is viewed, either marvellously ridiculous, or indescribably painful. Mr. Melvill himself speaks, in his last sermon more especially, of "young men who throng his Chapel:"—many of whom, it is no uncharitable supposition to imagine, flock to it, as a *school of oratory*, much more than as a house of prayer.

For their sakes we have offered the preceding observations.

Nor less indeed for Mr. Melvill's own. His present position, while it confers upon him an immediate popularity, will conduce but little, we apprehend, to his solid and lasting reputation. The sermons, which he has published, contain all the materials of greatness and excellence; but we cannot say, upon the whole, that they are great and excellent in their actual state. But the goal is before him. With the vigour of his mind yet unimpaired, and the prime of manhood scarcely yet upon his brow, we are of opinion, that, by the aid of calm study, and intellectual self-restraint, and well-regulated exertion, there is scarcely any thing which he might not accomplish,—scarcely any thing to which he might not aspire,—scarcely any thing of honour to himself,—and what it is our sincere belief, he would far more highly prize,—scarcely any thing of usefulness and advantage to others. As he outstripped his contemporaries in the proud competitions of the University, he has passed them again in the race of rhetorical distinction. But there is something much nobler, and much more elevated, within his reach. We wish, very warmly and very honestly, that he may not lose it through the unbridled strength of his own imagination, or the misjudging flattery of his wholesale admirers.

We feel confident, that, when Mr. Melvill considers the general scope and tendency of our strictures, he will not take offence at the tone of pleasantry, in which we have occasionally indulged. He will make the due distinction, between the part which is applicable to himself, and the part which is applicable to the “servile herd” of plagiarists, who will and do copy his peculiarities, without emulating his loftier and more valuable qualifications.

---

ART. XI.—*Extracts from the Information received by His Majesty's Commissioners as to the Administration and Operation of the Poor Laws.* 8vo. pp. 432.

INTERESTING as are the contents of the volume before us, and valuable as is the information contained in it, the mass of evidence is so undigested that it is a work of difficulty to compare the different accounts on the same subjects, so as to come at any useful conclusion. We could certainly have wished that some order or arrangement had been adhered to, or a better Index annexed, by which the Reports of the Assistant Commissioners on the same points, might have been more readily collated and compared. The confusion complained of has arisen because, in

furnishing his report, each individual has used his own discretion as to the manner of compiling the information which he obtained. One or two have answered the questions of the Commissioners in order, but most of them have adopted no regular plan whatever, but have set down their remarks without any arrangement. The report from Trechurst, Sussex, by Mr. Courthope, consists of plain, direct, and full answers to the questions proposed; and from the clear, definite and decisive information we have gained from them, we cannot but regret that the same simple plan was not pursued by all the reporters. But of all, we are most inclined to find fault with the voluminous report of Mr. Chadwick, a gentleman of first-rate information, knowledge and judgment on the subject in question, who seems nevertheless determined to mystify to others, that which we believe is clear to himself. As a whole his statement is so confused, so made up of shreds and patches, that when we turn over a page we hardly know where he is—in Town or Country, in London or Berkshire, in Spitalfields or Maidenhead Thicket:—yet we acknowledge this gentleman draws from this heterogeneous mass of evidence, inferences so correct, conclusive, and incontrovertible, that we doubt not the Commissioners will notice them as containing the most valuable suggestions in the whole volume.

Much as we had seen and heard of the ill effects of the administration and operation of the Poor Laws, we were hardly prepared for the details with which we are now made acquainted. The concluding paragraph of the introductory Letter to Lord Melbourne, strong as are the expressions in it, hardly conveys an adequate idea of what we read in the pages which follow.

“ The most important, and certainly the most painful part of its contents, are the proof that the maladministration, which was supposed to be principally confined to some of the agricultural districts, appears to have spread over almost every part of the country, and into the manufacturing towns; the proof that actual intimidation directed against those who are supposed to be unfavourable to profuse relief is one of the most extensive sources of maladministration; and the proof that the evil, though checked in some places by extraordinary energy and talent, is on the whole steadily and rapidly progressive.”

One of the greatest and most evident causes of the existing evils is the allowance system. It seems that the general custom in nearly the whole of the districts visited, and in some part of every one of them, is to allow money from the parish fund without requiring any labour in exchange, not only to the old or infirm, but to the most able-bodied who want it, or seem to want it; whether that

want arises from the farmer giving inadequate wages, or from the negligence of the pauper in not endeavouring to earn all he can; still, if the fact is admitted that the applicant is not in possession of money enough to buy provision for himself and family, in almost every case relief is granted without further inquiry, and that relief in most cases regulated according to a fixed scale, without any reference to character, or merit, or any circumstances, except the number of individuals to be provided for. The churchwarden of Lexham, in Kent, in answer to the question:—

“ ‘Is relief given according to any and what scale?’ says ‘Yes, the single man, 5s.; man and wife, 10s.; do., with one child, 12s.; do. with three, 13s., &c. to lay about in the roads;’ ”

and the answers of the vicar and assistant overseer agree with this. In Mr. Power's Report from Cambridge Town, and in Mr. Cowell's Report from the county, we find copies of a request from the magistrates, signed by their clerk and addressed to the overseers, that a certain scale of the minimum of allowance, according to the number of individuals to be relieved should be adhered to; and wherever the scale is in use, as in the home and southern counties, it is always understood that the wages actually earned by the labourer are to be taken into consideration, and the remainder of the allowance to be made up from the rates. The evils of this system are too apparent, and have been too often discussed to need other observation than that of the late intelligent Mr. Andrews, as quoted by Mr. Majendie:—

“What do the poor give for what they receive from the poor-rates? They give their honesty, their veracity, their industry, and every thing which tends to make a man a good member of society.”

We extract the following passage to show that the allowance system exists in cities and large towns as well as in the agricultural districts, where it has long been acknowledged to prevail. In the city of Oxford, which is under a local act, we find reported by the Rev. H. Bishop the following successful application for relief:—

“An habitual drunkard, ruined by the facility of obtaining parish aid, and who but for that might have done well, but now allows his wife and family to continue in a state a little above starving, came to ask for work, and obtained 7s. without work. Another, receiving 12s. a week, obtained 2s. this night: he wishes to have a fixed income (to use his own words) that he may know what he has to depend on.”—p. 116.

In the townships of Darlington and Barnard-Castle the al-

allowance system, described by Mr. Wilson as the radical vice of the poor laws, is patronized by the master manufacturers and magistrates with the same determination as we witness in the agricultural counties, and graduated after the same manner, according to the number in families.

In London relief is obtained and imposition practised to obtain it, far beyond what is possible in the country; though the allowance is more unequal and seldom regulated by any scale, yet it is often given without discrimination, and paupers not unfrequently receive it from more parishes than one; often claim and obtain it when they are in full work: instances of frauds of this description are scattered through the whole of Mr. Chadwick's extensive report. We extract some of the most flagrant.

The following extract from the evidence of Mr. Huish, assistant-overseer of St. George's, Southwark, will afford an example:—

“Some time ago there was a shoemaker, who had a wife and family of four children, who demanded relief of the parish, and obtained an allowance of 5s. a week. He stated that he worked for Mr. Adderly, the shoemaker, who now lives in the High Street, in the Borough. The man stated, in applying for relief, that, however he worked, he could earn no more than 13s. per week. A respectable washerwoman informed me, that the way in which this family lived was such, that she was convinced the man earned enough to support them honestly, without burthening the parish, and that it was a shame for them to receive relief. In consequence of this information I objected to the allowance; but one of the overseers, taking up the book, said, ‘But here is the account signed by Mr. Adderly himself; can you doubt so respectable a man?’ Still I was not satisfied, and I watched the man and found him going to Mr. Pulbrook's, in Blackfriars Road. When the man had quitted the shop, I went in and asked whether the man who had just left worked for them. Mr. Pulbrook stated that he did work for them, and had done so for the last twelve months; that he was one of the best shoemakers who had ever worked for him; that he earned only about 12s. a week; and that he (Mr. Pulbrook) regretted he had not more work for him. The man had left his book, which I borrowed. When the man came to the board, I said to him, ‘Do you know Mr. Pulbrook of Blackfriars Road?’ ‘Yes, I do, very well.’ ‘Do you ever work for him?’ ‘I have done a job now and then for him.’ I then asked whether he had not earned as much as 10s. or 12s. a week from him. His reply was, ‘No, never.’ I then produced the book between him and Mr. Pulbrook, from which it appeared that he had earned from 10s. to 12s. per week from the time stated. This took him by surprise, and he had no answer to make. The relief was refused him, and he never came again; I afterwards ascertained, that in addition to the 13s. a week which he earned from Mr. Adderley, and the 12s. a week which he earned from Mr. Pul-

brook, his wife and himself worked for Mr. Drew, the slop-seller, living at Newington Causeway, and earned 7s. a week from him. On the average of the year round they did not earn less than 30s. per week. The man was afterwards spoken to about the loss of the parish allowance, when he said, 'I did not like to lose it; it was a hard case; it was like a freehold to me, for I have had it these seven years.'"—p. 211.

In the evidence of Mr. Waite we find the following curious story:—

"One woman, named Mary Shave, the mother of a bastard child, being refused her 'pension,' went to the police office and obtained a summons. Whilst waiting at the office-door she related her tale to the vagrants in waiting. When the case was called on, a woman made her appearance as Mary Shave; I thought she was not the woman I had seen before; I said, 'Are you Mary Shave?' 'Yes,' she said, 'she was *the* Mary Shave, who had the misfortune to be the mother of a natural child, and who had been ill-used by the parish officers;' and she made out a circumstantial case, clearly to the satisfaction of the magistrates, who ordered her relief, which was immediately given to her. Soon afterwards, the real Mary Shave appeared and substantiated her claim, and she was relieved. The other had made off with the money."

Mr. Brushfield, a tradesman, residing in Spitalfields, and one of the parish officers of Christchurch, Spitalfields, states:—

"The first day I was in active office (25th of March, 1831,) a woman named Kitty Daley came to me for relief on account of the illness of her child—she came without her child. I knew this case, as the doctor said there ought to be something given to her, on account of the child being ill with the small-pox. I gave her sixpence, to serve until I had an opportunity of visiting her. In the course of the day, between the hours of ten and two o'clock, about forty or fifty applications were made to me for relief. Usually it is the practice of the parish officers to give away money on the representation and the appearance of the parties; indeed, it is scarcely possible for a tradesman, who has a retail-shop, to avoid giving away considerable sums of money, as the applicants excite the sympathy of his customers, and if he does not comply with their demands, they (the paupers) may and do raise mischievous tumults, and injure his business by their clamours and obstructions. They did injure my business in this way, and must injure the business of any man who does his duty. However, I determined to give no relief on the mere representations of the parties. I therefore took down the names and addresses of the applicants, for the purpose of visiting their residences. In the course of the forenoon three women came to request relief, and each brought in their arms a child, which she said had the small-pox. The child was ~~muffled~~ up very carefully. One woman showed me the arm of the child; the other showed me the face of the child which she had; the third gave



me a glance of the face of the child which she had. It appeared to me strange that there was so much small-pox about; when I saw the face of the third child it struck me as being the same child that had been shown to me before, though now in a different dress. On visiting the places where the parties said they resided, it was found that about one third of their statements of residences were falsehoods; no such persons were to be found."

In speaking of the impositions practised to obtain relief from the rates we must not omit to notice those used to obtain relief from the different charitable institutions in the metropolis and its vicinity. We trust the praiseworthy supporters of them will have their eyes opened by the evidence of the Rev. Mr. Stone, in the description of the ordinary operation of charity in the neighbourhood of Spitalfields: evidence, however, which, clever as it is, we cannot but think to be in some parts much too *dramatic*, too *ambitious*, too *highly coloured* for the serious and simple object which was in view. We forbear to extract it, as it has already appeared in many of the newspapers. He concludes with these words—certainly very unsatisfactory to those benevolent individuals who have expended large sums for the benefit, as they thought, of their fellow creatures—"I have contented myself, however, with describing the state of the district as regards charitable relief, and the extent to which that relief *may be*, and actually is, made to minister to improvidence and dependence."—p. 302.

In reference to the allowance system we regret to find in many instances (we are afraid we must in truth acknowledge generally) this system originated with the magistrates, and is by them persisted in with most unaccountable obstinacy. Proofs of this exist not only in the scales of allowance published by their authority, but also in their decisions and orders: one of which by three magistrates in Hertfordshire is reported by Mr. Cowell. Where too an improvement in the administration of the Poor Laws has been attempted by intelligent parish officers, too often has it failed through the interference of the magistrates, blindly bigoted to the old mode of proceeding: we forbear to make extracts on this painful point, but we refer our readers for proofs of it to pages 98, 101, 204, 262, 373, &c.

But it is with pleasure we find, that illustrious examples of "extraordinary energy and talents checking the growing evil," are not wanting among the magistracy and parochial clergy, as well as others. In Mr. Majendie's report of the parish of Stanford Rivers is the following statement.

"In the year 1821 the expenditure amounted to 1191*l*. In the year 1825, a gentleman of the name of Andrews, the occupier of a considerable farm, determined with the rest of the parishioners and the support of



a very intelligent and experienced magistrate, Mr. Oldham, to make a bold effort to put down pauperism. The weekly pay was at once struck off, and in the year ending, March 1826, the expenditure was 560*l*.

“ At the commencement of the new system very numerous applications were made to the select vestry, but they were strictly examined; where relief was necessary, in cases of illness or real distress, it was liberally granted; but refused unless requisite; and the labourers by degrees learnt to depend on their own resources. The rates gradually diminished, and the money expended on the poor alone, which in 1825 amounted to 834*l*., was in 1828 only 196*l*. The vestry determined that all capable of work should be employed, and that no relief should be given but in return for labour. The labourers improved in their habits and comforts. During the four years the system was in progress there was not a single commitment for theft or any other offence.”

After Mr. Andrews' death, Mr. Capel Cure, a principal proprietor, introduced the plan of an Incorporated Workhouse, as is related by Mr. Becher in his evidence before the House of Lords. Ten parishes united to erect the Ongar Workhouse, and the results of the workhouse system continue to be most satisfactory.

In St. Werburgh, Derby, we find that Mr. Mosley produced a considerable improvement, by placing the parish under Mr. Sturges Bourne's Vestry Act, and by a fixed determination to oppose the allowance system. This is plainly illustrated by comparing St. Werburgh with the parish of Chesterfield similarly situated.

<i>Township of the Borough of Chesterfield.</i>	<i>St. Werburgh's Parish, in the Borough of Derby.</i>
Population, 1831—5700.	Population, 1831—6349.
Total assessments in the years 1831 and 1832—£2645.	Average of 5 years' assessments—£1800.
Resolved not to act under Sturges Bourne's Act.	Adopted Sturges Bourne's Act.
Relief given to able-bodied men without work.	No relief given to able-bodied men without work.
No employment for able bodied men.	Employment found for able-bodied men, who are paid by the piece.
A commodious workhouse.	Inconvenient workhouse.
Paupers only employed in sweeping the streets and in running of errands.	Paupers not allowed to go out but by special order.
Poor in the workhouse, Oct. 1832—30.	Poor in the workhouse, Oct. 1832—48.
Out poor, Oct. 1832—149.	Out poor, Oct. 1832—88.

In the parish of Cookham, by the exertions of the Rev. Thomas Whateley the parochial expenditure was reduced from 3133*l*. to 1155*l*. and the general condition of the labouring classes improved; Mr. Russell, the magistrate of Swallowfield, stated that, in riding through Cookham, he was so struck with the appearance of comfort observable in the persons and residences of some of the labouring classes of that village, that he was led to make an enquiry into the cause. The answer he received determined him

to exert his influence to procure a similar change of system in Swallowfield. "During the agricultural riots, there was no fire, no riots, no threatening letters in Cookham parish. In the midst of a district which was peculiarly disturbed, Cookham, and White Waltham, where a similar system of Poor Law administration was adopted, entirely escaped, although in Cookham there were several thrashing machines, and the only paper-mill had, at the time of the riots, been newly fitted up with machinery."

But by far the most satisfactory description of improvement, is that reported by Mr. Cowell as having taken place at Bingham in Nottinghamshire, through the agency of the Rev. Mr. Lowe, a magistrate and the resident incumbent.

"In 1818-1819, Mr. Lowe undertook to remedy this state of things. Being satisfied that it proceeded entirely from the operation of the poor laws, and that there was no cause, independent of their influence, to prevent his parishioners from being happy, honest, and industrious; and knowing that it was impossible to refuse relief according to the practice and custom of the country, he devised means for rendering relief itself so irksome and disagreeable, that none would consent to receive it who could possibly do without it, while at the same time it should come in the shape of comfort and consolation to those whom every benevolent man would wish to succour—the old, infirm, idiots, and cripples.

"For this purpose he placed in the workhouse a steady, cool-tempered man, who was procured from a distance, and was not known in the parish, as master; refused all relief in kind or money, and sent every applicant and his family at once into the workhouse. The fare is meat three times a-week, soup twice, pudding once, milk porridge five times. Surely no man who says that he cannot maintain himself, wife, and children by the sweat of his brow—who declares that he is starving—who applies for charity, has a right to complain of being placed in a clean and comfortable house, of having a good bed to sleep on, and such fare every day as I have described above; and had Mr. Lowe stopped here, matters would not have been much mended. But the applicant who entered the workhouse, 'on the plea that he was starving for want of work,' was taken at his word, and told that these luxuries and benefits could only be given by the parish against work, and in addition, that a certain regular routine was established, to which all the inmates must conform. The man goes to one side of the house, the wife to the other, and the children into the school-room. Separation is steadily enforced. Their own clothes are taken off, and the uniform of the workhouse put on. No beer, tobacco, or snuff is allowed. Regular hours are kept, or meals forfeited. Every one must appear in a state of personal cleanliness. No access to bed-rooms during the day. No communication with friends out of doors. Breaking stones in the yard by the grate; as large a quantity required every day as an able-bodied labourer is enabled to break.

"But the monotony, the restraint, the want of stimulants, the regula-

city of hours, are irksome to the pretended pauper. He bethinks himself of liberty, and work he will find, if there is a job undone in the parish or neighbourhood within a day's walk. No man stood this discipline for three weeks. After a struggle which lasted a few months, the paupers of Bingham gave the matter up. The inmates of the workhouse dropped from forty-five to twelve, who were all either old, idiots, or infirm, and to whom a workhouse is really a place of comfort. The number of persons relieved out of the workhouse dropped from seventy-eight to twenty-seven. The weekly pay from 6*l.* to 1*l.* 16*s.* to pensioners, all of whom are old and blind, or crippled. These are permitted to live with their relations, as such instances of relieving out of the workhouse produce no mischief.

"Wages rose to twelve shillings a-week, winter and summer, all the year through; the labourer husbanded his resources, took a pride and pleasure in his cottage, and resumed his rank in the scale of moral being.

"The effect of this system is far more important in a moral point of view, than in a pecuniary or economical point of view. The conduct and habits of the population of Bingham, according to the representations of Mr. Lowe and Deane, and by the consent of the neighbourhood, is now as different from what it was fifteen years ago as can be conceived—no crimes, no mis-deeds, no disturbances."

After reading and witnessing the successful results of an administration of the existing laws by sensible and determined men, whose energy has resisted and destroyed the allowance system, with all the ills attendant on it, we may fairly ask whether the greatest evils of pauperism do not arise rather from the mal-administration of the Poor Laws, than the law itself; and if so, whether repeal of those statutes only which seemed to favour this mal-administration would not check the growth of these evils as effectually as the repeal of all the existing laws on the subject, and the formation of a new code on entirely different principles. It is proved, past all contradiction, that much of the mischief does arise entirely from mal-administration, and is traced to one source, *the allowance of relief to those who could work without labour in exchange.* The present law neither does, nor ever did, authorise such relief to be granted. The 43 Eliz. c. 2, enacts that the overseers of the poor shall take order for *setting to work* the children of such persons as cannot maintain them, and also for setting to work all married or unmarried persons having no means to maintain themselves, and allows them to raise sums for furnishing materials for such work. Then follows, "also for the necessary relief of the lame, impotent, old, and blind, and also for binding poor children apprentices." In a note on the subject in Mr. Chitty's edition of Burn, it is stated that there is a letter addressed to Lord Burghley by a county magistrate, which shows

that the great evil arising from habits of idleness among the poor began then to be understood, which strengthens the idea that one great object of the legislative provisions for the poor made about that time was to prevent able-bodied men from being unemployed. The next statute which it is material to notice as regulating the relief of the poor is 9 Geo. 1, s. 7. This act empowered overseers to provide "houses for the poor, where they might be lodged, maintained, and employed;" and ordered that such poor as should refuse to be lodged therein, should not be entitled to relief. By 22 Geo. 3, ch. 83, relative to the incorporation of parishes for the purpose of establishing a common poorhouse, the 9 Geo. 1, c. 67, is explained, and the manner of giving relief more particularly set forth. Section xxix. orders *that no person shall be sent to the workhouse except such as are become indigent by old age, sickness, or infirmity, or except orphan children*, (the proper and only objects of *gratuitous relief*;) but by sec. xxxii. any poor person who is able and willing to work, but cannot get employment, shall be set to work and properly maintained, lodged, or provided for, and the expense of his maintenance, &c. paid out of the profits of his labour, &c.; and these sections compared together evidently suppose a *workhouse* distinct from the *poorhouse*, and on this act is founded that system which has been patronized by Mr. Lowe, Mr. Becher, and others, with such satisfactory results. Before the time of this act, and for some years after, the mode of administering relief was confined to provision in the poorhouse or workhouse, either to the infirm gratuitously, or to the able-bodied and their families, in return for labour. In the year 1795, a winter of unusual scarcity, an act was passed, from which originated all the evils of the allowance system. By 36 Geo. 3, c. 15, justices were authorised to order relief to poor persons at their own houses. "The scarcity continuing in 1796," as is stated in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, "the county magistrates in Berkshire, and afterwards in other parts of the middle and south of England, agreed to relieve the poor according to a fixed and uniform scale, regulated by the price of bread, and issued a table which professed to show at one view what should be the weekly income of the labouring poor, which it fixed at a certain ratio, according to the price of bread and size of the family. The practical operation of this system is, that if the allowance of A. and B. is the same on the table, say 12s., and A. is industrious and earns 8s., he receives the rest from the parish; but B. is so idle and dishonest that no one will employ him, gets the whole 12s. from the parish."

The ill effect of this upon the industry and the prudence of the labourers has been already enlarged upon; and most of the evils recorded in the book before us seem traced to this source. It is plain such evils may at once be remedied by cutting off the source from which they spring, that is, by repealing that act which authorises relief to be given to the poor at their own houses; and then the exemplary administration of the law by Mr. Becher, Mr. Lowe, and others, must be adopted by all, at least in its general principle. We have seen it proved, that by the adoption of this system,\* the growth of pauperism is at once checked. A distinction will then at once be made between the independent labourer and the pauper, and an end will be put to the impositions practised in town, as well as those practised almost as extensively by out-dwellers in the country. We own the opinion of that very intelligent magistrate of Sussex, Mr. Courthope, as expressed in his answers to questions 14 and 16, is against the practicability of this plan in his neighbourhood; but we must remember those answers were made while the dreadful scenes of 1830 were fresh in his remembrance, and he seems to think farmers would agree with the labourers in their resistance to it. Yet he acknowledges that among all the remedies he has seen tried, some of which were equally hazardous, and as decidedly obnoxious to the labourers, not one was tried with the least success. But in Berkshire, in a neighbourhood where the labourers were almost as riotously inclined, we find, from the evidence of the Rev. Mr. Cherry, of Burghfield, that the whole of the single labourers, generally the most tumultuous, "hailed the notification that rates would no longer be allowed in aid of wages with great satisfaction, as they considered it would render wages in future more proportioned to their labour, and that a single man would have a better chance." But we have an opinion in our favour which is of great value; it is that of Lord Mansfield, in the case of *Rex v. St. Paul and St. Peter, Bath*: he thus expressed his decided approbation of the workhouse system:—"The want of workhouses was, however, soon felt as an inconvenience; they were not long after introduced by the legislature, and, if well regulated, a most desirable mode of relief they

\* There is no mention made in these Reports of the effects which the workhouse system has produced in *Bishops-Hatfield*, Herts, where it was introduced under the auspices of the Marquis of Salisbury. The beneficial effects of the system were so evident, that it is now becoming general in that neighbourhood: it has been adopted, with the most pleasing prospect of success, in the parishes of Walton, Welwyn, Hertingfordbury, and others, and has in no case failed of giving satisfaction both, to the farmers and the labourers.

are; they supply comfort and accommodation for those that cannot work, and employment for those who can " His lordship then adds an explanation of the wisdom of 22 Geo. 3, ch. 15, empowering parishes to unite, that workhouses may be on a scale sufficiently large. Mal-administration may produce much mischief in the workhouse system as in any other: perhaps it has done more mischief here than in any other—where the provision is better in the workhouses than the independent labourer can obtain out of it,—where the accommodation is far superior to that of his cottage,—where the liberty in both is equal,—where idleness is allowed, and classification not insisted on. All this mischief would be in a great measure prevented by separating the poorhouse from the workhouse, making the one a refuge for those who could not work, the other a residence for those who could; ensuring tolerable comfort in the first, but merely providing necessities in the other, and insisting on work, regularity, restraint, and separation. It is not to be desired that even the aged and infirm should wish to come to the poor house, or that they should look forward to the time when they should take to it as their abode; it would be much more natural, that they should expect to be supported and assisted by their children and relations in their old age, and in their dying moments attended by those dear to them. If they are compelled to throw themselves on the public for their support, let them be taught to look to it only as a last resource, destitute of any recommendation beyond that of security from positive want. If we look at the extraordinary scale of allowance obtained by the labourer, and given to the soldier, pauper, and prisoner, and convicted felon, we cannot but acknowledge that it seems to us a lure from honesty and loyalty, to the poorhouse and the prison, to pauperism and crime—a lure which, we fear, has already been too effective to that purpose.\*

But to return to the mischief which must accrue from mal-administration in any system. If any alteration is made in the law, the cause of mischief which is known must be guarded against by not trusting too great a power in the first place in the hands of those who have an interest to misuse it; secondly, in the hands of those who have no interest to use it well. For examples of abuse of this power, look on the one hand to the practice of the farmers paying their labourers out of the poor rate; on the other, to that of the county magistrates agreeing to it. Nothing could so much tend to prevent the mischief which we

\* Independent labourer, 122oz. of food—Soldier, 168oz.—Pauper, 151—Suspected thief, 181—Convicted thief, 239—Transported thief, 333.



foresee, as the arrangement of workhouses on a very large scale, placing the whole management in the hands of a well-paid officer, under the control of a select committee, without any appeal from them. An example of a large establishment of this kind which answers completely, is found in Mr. Henderson's Report from Liverpool. A workhouse of a large extent, capable of containing 1750 paupers, under an intelligent governor, has completely succeeded in lowering the expenditure and checking pauperism. The whole account is very interesting, but too long for an extract; one observation of the governor is well worth attending to, as we believe it to be strictly true, that "1800 paupers are as easily managed as 500." From most of the large manufacturing towns the report is equally satisfactory, and it is here we see the success of the select vestry act, because in these large towns a number of well informed, intelligent individuals are found to form the vestry, men whose judgment can be relied on, and who have an interest that everything should be well managed; and here too the workhouses, from their size, admit of classification—of adequate means of employment—of schools of industry, and above all, of governors of superior attainments, and of great respectability. Still we look on the workhouse system as an effectual remedy only to a certain class of evils, of those which arise from the allowance system; these are the most pressing and should be cured first. This system alone will be no cure for the ill inherent in the principle, which induces any description of persons to look for relief or support from any other source but their own care, industry and forethought. Yet we have proofs that this system has been adopted with the best effect, and it has this great advantage, that it acts together with many other remedies, as the savings banks, the friendly insurance societies, and the allotment system. These, especially the two former, are antidotes against the principle of pauperism; but by the present system they are discountenanced by the employer, and consequently seldom had recourse to by the labourer. From the evidence of several persons we find, that, where the allowance system is adhered to, the farmer will seldom employ any labourer, who is known to have money in the savings bank, or property of any kind.

A measure has been tried, which has gained some advocates in the agricultural districts; we allude to the labour rate, a measure very much of the same nature as the act above found fault with, and the allowance system consequent on it, a measure advocated only in a season of great difficulty and rendered advisable only by the former temporising system. Had relief never been allowed at the houses of the poor, the allowance and scale system never would have been suffered, and



then the labour rate would never have been thought of. The labour rate tended to increase pauperism and all the evils attendant on it; it even legalized one of the worst of those evils, the confusion of wages and relief. "Wages, considered as the result of a bargain between the capitalist and the labourer for the advantage of both parties, can hardly be said to exist under the labour rate any more than under the allowance system." Under the labour rate too, "the lot of every man is the same; every one must be employed as allotted, even by the master who is most unwilling to have him and whom he is most unwilling to serve; in addition to this, that which Lord Mansfield called "a radical defect in our poor law system" is by this measure carried to its extreme, *"that the poor should be confined to their respective parishes."* His lordship added *"there should be no clog or restraint."* Were the labour rate generally in use, not only would the poor who are in their own parishes be confined thereto, but labourers working in parishes to which they did not belong, however beneficially employed for themselves or for their masters, would be sent back to their own parishes and prohibited seeking at large work most suitable for them, being compelled to do at home that which they least understood, and which might be least fit for them. In the volume before us we are happy to find that the labour rate is no where recommended, but always described as a delusive measure, and as one capable of producing great injustice and oppression. That some benefit was derived from it, where well managed, we do not deny; where things have arrived at the very worst, every change must be for the better, and so where the allowance system had been carried to its full extent, the labour rate was hailed by the farmers as a measure of great wisdom, but even the trial of one year undeceived most of them. It is with the utmost satisfaction we see at the head of the Poor Law Commission, the name of that distinguished prelate, by whose wisdom and eloquence this time-serving measure was so effectually opposed. We feel confident that under his lordship's auspices a Report will be sent to his majesty suggesting some remedy which will tend not only to palliate the symptoms, but radically to cure the malady.

But were the allowance system at once declared illegal as long as the bastardy laws remain, we cannot but expect that immorality will be prevalent among the lower orders. These laws, which were at first intended to punish immorality, have, by their unfortunate connexion with the poor laws, most effectually encouraged it. Licentiousness, perjury, and an utter contempt of the sacredness of marriage, have been the fruits of them. By the dread of them, the more innocent victim

of seduction has been terrified into infanticide—by them the prostitute is induced to add extortion and perjury to her other crimes—by them, as at present administered, a premium is given to unchastity. For we find that the allowance ordered for an illegitimate child is generally greater, and often double, that which is fixed for the support of one that is legitimate. Among other instances Mr. Cowell states that, at Basford, Notts,

“A widow, with a legitimate child, is never allowed more than 1*s.* 6*d.* sometimes less, and sometimes nothing,—depends on her earnings. A woman with bastards is sure of 2*s.* a week with each—yes, even if she were earning 20*s.* a week.”

The order on the father is for 2*s.* a week, but depends on his circumstances:—a direct premium to a woman to forswear her child to the richest, and a premium also to her yielding to a rich seducer. The punishment inflicted on the mother has seldom any effect but to harden her, and punishment is often suffered by the father in consequence of perjury which he cannot contradict. In our knowledge, a young man was this year committed to the house of correction in Essex for disobedience of orders of bastardy, and, after he had been imprisoned three weeks, the girl who had sworn the child acknowledged she was perjured and applied to re-swear the child to another. If no provision were made for bastards, unless separated from their mother, and the mother punished on application for relief, we feel sure there would be fewer illegitimate children; and it might be advisable that the maintenance of bastards should be at the expense of the county, not the parish; but this arrangement must alter the law of settlement.\* We will conclude our observations on the subject of the bastardy laws with the very sensible comments of Mr. Cowell.

“The theory of a law—the text of a law is nothing. The practice of the law is the real law. It is according to the practice that men shape their actions, and according to nothing else. The practice of the English law respecting bastardy is shortly this—Whenever a woman is pregnant of a bastard child, which the overseer apprehends may become chargeable to the parish, or whenever a woman applies for relief for her bastard after having given birth to it, the overseer has power to compel her on oath to declare the father, and then to compel him to pay the parish the amount of whatever order of maintenance the magistrates may make upon him. The sole object of the legislature is to save ex-

\* Among political economists, the law of settlement seems as much objected to as any part of the poor laws. It did not exist in its present complicated case until long after the statute of Elizabeth. Birth at first, and afterwards three years residence, gave the pauper a claim on the parish. If not entirely repealed, we cannot see why the law should not be restored to its ancient simplicity.

pense to the parish. The effect of it is, as might be foreseen, to promote bastardy—to make want of chastity on the woman's part, the shortest road to obtaining either a husband or a competent maintenance; and to encourage extortion and perjury. It would be impossible for the heart of man or demon to devise a more effective instrument for extinguishing every noble feeling in the female heart—for blighting the sweetest domestic affections—for degrading the males and females of that portion of the community connected with the receipt of parish relief—than this diabolical institution.”—pp. 391, 392.

Strong as are these expressions, we believe they do not state more than the truth. We feel convinced the morality of the lower orders would be promoted rather than injured by the total repeal of the bastardy laws. We see so much positive evil in the continuance of them, that no government can work any efficient reform in the poor laws, as long as the law of bastardy remains in force.

We have hitherto purposely omitted noticing that part of these extracts which refers to the riots in the disturbed districts, because the notice of that subject could not well be mixed up with general observations on the poor laws. The origin of those acts of incendiarism and riot seems still involved in mystery, though the spread of the spirit of disturbance, when once roused, is more easily accounted for. We are told “that the riots in the north east part of the rape of Hastings commenced simultaneously on the 5th and 6th of November, 1830. The farmers observed that their labourers all at once left their work: they were taken away by night by a systematic arrangement: no leader could be identified, but bills were run up at the public houses in the evening, and in the morning a stranger came and paid.” It appears then, there were other agents than the labourers dissatisfied with their allowance, or the farmers quarrelling with tithes; these were good tools in the hands of others; it is true the former imbibed the spirit of disturbance with readiness, and the latter did not attempt to subdue it. The seed of rebellion, for it was nothing less, was sown in the right soil, in Sussex and East Kent, where half the populace has been engaged in smuggling, “where,” says Mr. Majendie, “the labourers have acquired the habit of acting in large gangs by night, and of systematic resistance to authority. High living is become essential to them, and they cannot reconcile themselves to the moderate pay of lawful industry.” The peacefully inclined were forced to conspire with their audacious companions, and the smaller farmers, who felt they could not resist, consented to add their grievances to the common lot, and seeing that the determined hands who were at work seemed likely to carry their point, thought they should be

on the right side, and, if they were forced to pay higher wages, should free themselves from an adequate burden of tithes. That the mal-administration of the poor laws aggravated these causes cannot be doubted, and that it might of itself produce calamities equally to be dreaded. The very principle of this mal-administration is, that it undertakes to do more than it is able to do. Beneficial occupancy has, in some cases, as at Cholesbury, been annihilated by the operation of the poor laws, and where there is no beneficial occupancy, there can be no rate and no relief. The poor then must be in a state of as desperate want, as if there was no law for their relief at all; and their recklessness will be the greater because they have always been taught to depend on the law, and not on themselves, for support. But this was not exactly the case in the disturbed districts. However the labourers might be taught to think they were aggrieved by low pay, and however the farmers might persuade them that they were unable to pay them higher wages in consequence of the alleged extortion of the clergyman, yet these were causes of the increase of the disturbances, but not of their beginning; indeed the increase and spread were unfortunately promoted by the dissensions between the parish officers and magistrates, and by the yielding and timid conduct of the latter. An efficient police can be the only sure preventive against the recurrence of such scenes. An alteration in the administration and operation of the poor laws alone will remove those causes, which must render the spirit of disturbance so fatally contagious—the discontent and habitual idleness of the lower orders.

We have trespassed on our readers' attention much further than we intended, and still we find we have commented on a very small portion of the information contained in this volume; but we cannot conclude without making an extract of the inferences which Mr. Chadwick has drawn from the large body of evidence which he collected.

1. "That the existing system of poor laws in England is destructive to the industry, forethought, and honesty of the labourer: to the wealth and morality of the employers of labour and of the owners of property; and to the mutual good will and happiness of all. That it collects and chains down the labourers in masses, without any reference to the demand for their labour. That while it increases their numbers it impairs the means by which the fund for their subsistence is to be reproduced, and impairs the motives for using those means which it suffers to exist: and that every year and every day these evils are becoming more overwhelming in magnitude and less susceptible of cure.

2. "That of these evils, that which consists merely in the amount of the rates, an evil great when considered by itself, but trifling when compared with the moral effects which I am deploring, might be much diminished by the combination of workhouses, and by substituting a

rigid administration and contract management for the existing scenes of neglect, extravagance, jobbing, and fraud.

3. "That by an alteration, or even according to the suggestion of many witnesses an abolition, of the law of settlement, a great part, or according to the latter suggestion the whole, of the enormous sums now spent in litigation and removals might be saved; the labourers might be distributed according to the demand for labour; the emigration from Ireland of labourers of inferior habits checked, the oppression and cruelty to which the unmarried labourers and those who have acquired any property are now subjected, might, according to the extent of the alteration, be diminished or utterly put an end to.

4. "That if no relief were allowed to be given to the able bodied or to their families, except in return for adequate labour or in a well-regulated workhouse, the worst of the existing sources of evil, the allowance system, would immediately disappear; a broad line would be drawn between the independent labourer and the paupers; the number of paupers would be immediately diminished, in consequence of the reluctance to accept relief on such terms; and would be still further diminished in consequence of the increased fund for the payment of wages occasioned by the diminution of rates, and would ultimately, instead of forming a constantly increasing proportion of our whole population, become a small, well-defined part of it, capable of being provided for at an expense less than one half of the present poor rates.

5. "That the proposed changes would tend powerfully to promote providence and forethought, not only in the daily concerns of life, but in the most important of points, marriage; and lastly, that it is essential to the working of every one of these improvements that the administration of the poor laws, should be intrusted, as to their general superintendence, to one central authority with extensive powers, and as to their details, to paid officers, acting under the consciousness of constant superintendence and strict responsibility."—pp. 338, 339.

There is little doubt that these valuable suggestions will not be lost sight of in the recommendation of any plan of improvement by the commissioners. It may not be advisable at once to make so great a change in the law of the land, but some alteration is loudly called for. Unless some alteration takes place immediately, Cholesbury will not be a solitary instance of a parish thrown out of cultivation and unable to support its poor. It is rather extraordinary that such a case was provided for by the very first statute that established poor rates. Yet it is a case of which few examples are on record from that time to this. But these must become more frequent; for in the home counties even now, through the pressure of the rates, many farmers are insolvent; and land, when given up by one tenant, can hardly be provided with another. Nor is this all: the labourers are daily growing a more discontented, more dissatisfied, and more demoralized race; and our peasantry, instead of being the nation's pride, are likely to become sources of disgrace, and danger, and perpetual disturbance.

## ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

THE department of our publication which has hitherto possessed the character of an "Ecclesiastical Record," has consisted chiefly, if not entirely, of the names of "Clergymen preferred" to dignities or benefices; or "Clergymen appointed" to particular situations; or "Clergymen deceased," with a designation of the Preferment become vacant by their deaths, the County, the Diocese, and the Patron; the list of Ordinations, and the usual proceedings of the Universities. This department we intend very considerably to alter and enlarge; and we have been actuated by several reasons. In the first place, the former plan seemed to contain matter, which, while it often occupied more space than we could well afford, was scarcely adapted to a work of critical discussion or historical research: matter too which is either to be found in other publications, or which may be easily, and perhaps usefully, gathered into a cheap and separate form, and put forth, every year, as a Clerical Calendar and Church of England Directory.

Again, such a record appeared inadequate to the conjuncture in which we are placed. Something more is demanded, by the progress of Christianity, on the one side; and, on the other, by the critical state of the Church of England. We are anxious also to put ourselves into a more immediate intercourse and connection with the ministers and the friends of the Establishment, by providing such a register of events, and such a view of affairs, as may invite them to send us any *facts* of which they may happen to be in possession—any *plans* which they may wish to propose—any *information* which they think serviceable to an undertaking which stands forward, consistently and temperately, steadfastly and honestly, to defend the interests of religion, and the ecclesiastical constitution of the country, in the hour of trial—the hour of peril—and, it may be, the hour of subversion.

We propose, therefore, to give, not a mere catalogue of individual names, or occurrences which relate only to individuals; but a general survey of the times, and the transactions of the times, as they affect the cause of the Church, and the promotion of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. We have no wish or purpose to interfere unfairly with other excellent periodicals—there is room enough for us all; but we would complete our own idea of what our title includes—"a Theological Review,"—an "Ecclesiastical Record,"—and a "Critical" tribunal, where all things shall be judged upon "British" principles of candour and truth, and by the standard of a sound and genuine Christianity. As in the body, then, of our Review, we shall take up those books, and those topics of discussion, which either are most important, or from peculiar circumstances demand peculiar regard; so, at the end, we shall endeavour to supply previous omissions, and almost fill up the whole circle of intelligence; in the hope that, from quarter to quarter, all that really requires to be known and understood with reference to the Church may be found in some one or other of our pages.

Our aim, in short, is to present an ecclesiastical history of the period, brief



but comprehensive; looking at all events which have taken place; all subjects which are engaging the public mind; all measures set on foot by the Government, and all projects agitated among the people; observing all schemes of general or parochial improvement; paying attention to all the reports of all societies, religious, or charitable, or educational, and all attempts at human amelioration by the philanthropy of legislatures, or associations, or individuals; as, for instance, by emigration, or allotment of grounds, or colonization, whether in Canada, or Van Diemen's land, or upon the Swan River, or in the Azores; and embracing, as occasion may serve, missionary labours abroad, and the state of the dioceses at home; and, as far as we have room, the obituary of distinguished persons.

In order that our readers may have some slight acquaintance at least with every thing that is going forward in relation to the church, we shall add to this digest, or summary of events, a slight notice, under a methodized arrangement, of all, or almost all, the works which have been published during the past quarter, and which come under our general plan. And here let us premise, once for all, that we should be sorry to have it considered as necessarily a disparagement to a work, if we assign to it only a cursory notice instead of an elaborate criticism; for it is abundantly obvious that many things may induce us to expatiate in an extended review, quite independent of the intrinsic value or consequence of a production, and many things again determine us to pass it over with a very few words of comment, quite distinct from any inherent worthlessness or insignificance. For example, a book may be so universally read, that to give extracts would be more than superfluous; or so excellent and so consonant to our own views, that we should have nothing to do but to express our entire concurrence and our hearty approbation. On the contrary, a volume may be very foolish, very wicked, and very absurd, and yet so calculated to mislead and to work mischief, that it becomes requisite to visit it with a lengthened exposure; or it may be so made up of mingled and opposite qualities, that more time must be employed to separate the good from the evil; or it may call for a more anxious commendation, because, though excellent in itself, it may not be on the high road to immediate popularity. Be it also understood, that, in affording but a short notice in the first instance, we shall not regard ourselves as altogether precluded from afterwards bestowing a criticism more careful and minute.

It is our intention, as far as our limits will allow us, to introduce strictures upon *foreign* theology, and likewise upon *foreign* politics and statistics, and literature, as far as they are connected with the moral and religious well-being of man.

These few observations will suffice to make our plan intelligible. Well are we aware that to sketch such a plan is a far more easy matter than to execute it. We scarcely expect that our execution of it will satisfy even ourselves; but we shall do what we can. We cannot promise to be able and eloquent; but we do promise to be faithful and impartial. We do pledge ourselves to pursue that course which we believe to be right, without fear and without favour, because we know ourselves to be impelled by higher and better motives than worldly reputation or worldly profit, although we have not the affectation



to pretend that motives such as these have no influence over our minds. They, indeed, who can penetrate and appreciate the actual state of the Church, who are truly sensible how she is assailed by invective and fraud, by brazen mendacity and insidious slander; and alas! how she is torn by disunion and weakened by dissension, and at times seems almost to court the doom of a "house divided against itself;" who perceive how fierce and sanguine are her enemies without, and how they, upon whom she has counted as friends, are some of them intemperate and injudicious,—some lukewarm and faint-hearted,—some, we even apprehend, false and hollow; such persons do not require to be told that to carry forward an ecclesiastical review is not to tread a flowery path of ease, and comfort, and cheap applause; but to fight, under growing disadvantages, the battle of a dispirited side; to espouse the cause of many who are ready in their alarms to give up their own cause for lost; to incur the obloquy and misrepresentation of the million; and, what is ten thousand times more painful, sometimes to displease the very parties whom there is the most earnest and conscientious desire to propitiate and support.

Let us only request, both for our general strictures, and for the Record which we are about to commence, that, if we agree in essentials, our readers will not be easily offended, where, in particular points, our sentiments are different. Things have been thrown into a position so strange and complicated, that variances of opinion upon minor points must and will occur; but it is still a consolation that there are certain fixed principles and immoveable landmarks which can serve always for our common guidance.

It is high time, however, to leave these generalities; nor, in fact, should we have dwelt upon them so long, but that, on the one hand, it was necessary to explain our views; and that, on the other, few particular events have happened during the recess of Parliament; and that, although we begin our change of plan with the beginning of the year and the volume, we have thought that the best starting-post for a regular summary would be the first of January, 1834: and that it might create confusion to give any details of transactions, which had happened in the conclusion of the previous year.

There are, as might be expected, various rumours afloat with regard to the alterations meditated by government in ecclesiastical affairs. Sundry particulars even have been mentioned to us; and the popular opinion seems to be, that the plan attempted by the legislature will be what is called a "*searching and radical reform.*" As, however, political prophecies are usually falsified by the event, and as we may be mistaken in our own anticipations, we shall reserve our opinions until we can grapple with some specific propositions, instead of perhaps contending with shadows, and beating the air.

Even on the matter of Church-rates, we shall now keep silence; for the Church is put on its defence: and we know how much advantage will be taken of particular admissions, which they who make them would very possibly *not* make if they could see their bearing upon *ulterior* measures, and their connection with the whole scheme in contemplation by their adversaries. It is quite obvious that churchmen, and especially clergymen, can have no partial attachment to the system of church-rates *for its own sake*. It is not their *interest* to

perpetuate an impost which brings them into disagreeable collision with their neighbours and their parishioners: but in these days, when, even in the metropolis, we hear of some churches being *pulled down*, and others being left in a dingy and discreditable state because there is an unwillingness to advance money for the purpose of having them *whitewashed*, there ought to be, and there must be, some security that the temples of God will not be allowed to fall into dilapidation and dirt; and we may remember how even the heathen poet could connect the anger of heaven with a disregard of the sacred edifices of the land. Men may of course talk about voluntary contributions, having formed the very prudent resolve that their *own* contribution shall be *nil*; or they may wish to throw the whole burden upon the shoulders of the minister; albeit in times when a clergyman's income is to be legislated down, like the tapering dimensions of a lady's waist,

*"Small by degrees, and beautifully less."*

But yet we are not quite without hopes that some wise and statesmanlike mode of meeting the difficulty will be devised and adopted.

Be this as it may, things are in progress, of which the consequences will infinitely transcend any adjustment of church-rates. There are now three parties into which, with reference to the Church, our population must be divided. There is, first, the party of the more violent dissenters, who wish, upon principle, that the whole ecclesiastical establishment should be swept away; and they are aided and abetted by a class of persons, immeasurably less respectable, who bear a determined hatred to *compulsory* payments of every kind and description whatsoever—*non-compulsory* payments seldom being allowed to give them much disquietude. There is, secondly, the party which would alter the Articles, and the Liturgy, and the offices of the Church, and so widen the door for the return of wandering sheep into the fold; who, perhaps, however, would not choose to come back; or who might even assume the shape and bearing of certain more destructive animals, not long after their re-admission. There is a third party, who, while they profess a readiness to correct any real grievance, and abolish any practical abuse, are reluctant even to talk about concessions, until they can be explicitly and unequivocally told upon what points, and to what extent, concessions will be demanded.

For our own parts, we confess that it is an object with us to force out, as far as we can, the genuine and *esoteric* opinions of the several classes of dissenters and infidels; in the hope both that *ministers* will be put upon their guard, and that when it is seen how stern, how unrelenting, how implacable, are the foes of the Church, the friends and ministers of the Church will be bound into closer bonds of amity and good will among themselves.

And here we come to a subject on which we should be well pleased to say nothing, if we had not inflexibly determined to speak out upon all points which concern the honour and advantage of the Church of England. We hear, not merely of addresses to particular dignitaries, who might well deserve any and every compliment and mark of respect, but of Church Associations, at Oxford and other places, either formed or projected among clergymen. The bias of our

opinion, much as we may respect many individuals who have been named as likely to belong to them, is certainly unfavourable to all such unions. We doubt their necessity—we doubt their utility—we doubt their discretion; and the grounds of our opinion are, that the clergy have other and more legitimate modes of making known their sentiments, either collectively or individually; that associations tend to produce counter-associations, and that thus new sources of the bitterest hostility and irritation may be engendered and kept up; that they might derange the regular system and gradation of ecclesiastical government and order; and that such unions must have the appearance of being either “Churchmen against Churchmen,” which is a spectacle which we should deprecate and deplore; or “Church against Laity,” which is a spectacle which we should still more deplore and still more deprecate; or “Church against Government,” which is an exhibition that, without any secret consciousness of time-serving propensities, we are inclined to discourage, until there occurs some gross case of provocation and aggression. And as a distinction has been studiously drawn between England and Ireland—where, indeed, bishoprics are dropping away, not like stars setting, but stars extinguished—they, whose apprehensions are most fearful as to the future, have yet scarcely a right to *array themselves* against the government on account of anything which in England has been actually done. For whatever intentions may be entertained and *circular missives sent*, the abolition of all legal provision for the clergy is now openly advocated only by the radical regenerators of our large town; and the scheme of expelling the bishops “at one fell swoop” from the House of Lords is put into a tangible form only by the wise heads of Mr. Rippon and his constituents at Gateshead.

We close these observations by saying, that all which we have since seen and heard confirms us in two opinions, which we have already pronounced. The one is, that everything which is worth a struggle will be gained or lost, just as the clergy, in their respective stations throughout the kingdom, succeed or fail in securing the affections of the *people*: just as they look, not to ministers, who are comparatively powerless, whether for good or evil; not to political friends or patrons, who have no power at all; but to the mass of English men and women with whom they are brought in contact. The other is, that the *lay* members of the Church of England ought now to stand prominently forward. *They*, if they love the Church, and think its existence necessary to the soundness and purity of religion—they, we confidently re-assert, ought to stand forward to refute those outrageous and barefaced calumnies which are levelled against the rights and character of the clergy at meeting after meeting, and which are so outrageous, and so barefaced, that they might only provoke a smile, if we were not certain that there are thousands so stupid that they believe them, and thousands more so unprincipled, that, although they know better, yet, from sordid motives, they pretend to believe them.

Among other mighty questions, not strictly theological, or altogether ecclesiastical, the two, perhaps, which, either on account of their intrinsic moment, or their intimate connection with the religious and social welfare of a people, or

their pressing demands upon our attention from accidental and temporary circumstances; most claim a deep and diligent scrutiny, are the subject of the Poor Laws, and the subject of National Education. That they are closely interwoven between themselves, at once in a moral and financial point of view, is a position to which all who are acquainted with both, or either, of them will instantly assent. Of the present state of the Poor-Law question, some account will be found in another place. Of the prospective expedients which may be devised we entertain a good hope, unless, indeed, we have already arrived at a crisis in which "*nec mala, nec remedia malorum, pati possumus*;" unless a degraded and pauper population is unable to endure those wholesome restorations which must conduce to its future comfort, although they may not be conformable to its existing habits. The formation of a *Central Board* seems to be generally expected, and "*centralization*" is the fashion of the day. We shall not enter into discussion upon the abstract principle, rather reserving our sentiments until the Boards are actually appointed, and the details respecting them are fixed; but thus much we may suggest, that an attempt altogether to *continentalize* our institutions will be neither popular nor wise. And this remark might naturally lead us to the topic of national education; but our space unfortunately will not permit us to deal as we could wish with the mistakes in theory, and the misstatements of facts, which, upon the matter of national education—whether it is to be by the state, or by individuals and associations—are now spread, and reiterated, and multiplied among us. We shall forthwith, however, devote our closest attention to the subject; and we have a perfect confidence that, from the data which we possess, we shall be enabled to rectify many errors; and to throw light upon the thick confusion and obscurity of ideas which now generally prevail both as to the introduction of foreign systems, and as to the working of our own. And this we are anxious to do in our next publication, because, about that time, or shortly after that time, the subject will probably be brought before the legislature, and take a strong hold of the public mind.

While we keep our own eye upon those schemes of parochial melioration which are now, we rejoice to say, eagerly caught up through every district of the empire, we shall be glad to receive any authentic and practical communications; and also any information, from actual experience, as to the feasibility of the annuity plan attached to savings' banks.

With respect to the "*Reports of Societies*," we must now be in arrears; for, as our present sketch has rather the nature of an experiment, or a prospectus, we have not left ourselves room to digest either the transactions and statements of the associations themselves, or our own comments upon them, into any shape of lucid and systematic arrangement. The general question as to the proper sphere and province of associations, and the best mode of effecting their legitimate objects, is one which, in the present state of society and social science, deserves and claims a far more careful and comprehensive examination than, as far as our information extends, it has ever hitherto obtained.

We subjoin a few notices of books, without, however, promising any uniform

adherence to the division of subjects, which we have now adopted for our immediate convenience. In fact, whether philosophical classification is at all practicable, where several departments of theology so perpetually cross one another, and mingle with one another, and where the various works come to us, each after each, in different periods of the quarter, is a point upon which we feel considerable difficulty, and upon which practical experience will be the safest guide.

---

#### RELIGION IN ITS CONNECTION WITH SCIENCE.

*Bampton Lectures.* By Frederick Nolan, LL.D. F.R.S. 1. *The Analogy of Revelation and Science.* Published by J. H. Parker, Oxford, and J. G. Rivington, London. 1833. 2. *Revelation and Science.* By the Rev. Baden Powell, M.A. F.R.S. Oxford, printed for J. H. Parker, and J. G. Rivington, London, 1833.

CHRISTIANITY has passed through many ordeals; the ordeal of historical research, the ordeal of critical scholarship, the ordeal of logical and metaphysical investigation. It has now to go through the ordeal of *physical science*. It must be submitted to the test of astronomical and geological, of chemical and physiological, phenomena; and we make no complaint. We are quite content that it should be subjected to any fair trial, conducted upon the legitimate principles of enlarged and accurate reasoning. We have not a doubt—not a shadow of doubt,—about the ultimate result. We seek not to arrest the progress of physical science, or divert it a hair's breadth from its proper course; but we do think the manner of instituting and carrying on the examination to be a matter of vital moment. We are even more afraid of friends than antagonists; and the last two publications emanating from members of the Church, under somewhat imposing circumstances, have considerably increased our apprehensions. Dr. Nolan and Mr. Powell rush into the opposite extremes. Dr. Nolan has a fanciful theory, by which he endeavours sometimes to oppose Scriptural to inductive philosophy, and sometimes to torture the Mosaic account into a verbal and literal rather than a substantial accordance with present appearances and modern systems. Mr. Powell maintains the monstrous proposition, that the truth or falsehood, in *any* sense, of the physical accounts recorded in the Bible, cannot affect the argument in support of Christianity; in short, that it matters nothing if we allow all the physics of the Bible, and a great part of the history, to be an “absolute contradiction” to the actual facts. Therefore, if we understand him aright, he is prepared to give up the origin of mankind from a single pair,—the deluge,—the six days, or periods of creation; and utterly heedless, as it seems, what *doctrines hinge* upon these occurrences, or to what extent God's moral government is here represented as connected with his physical dispensations, he actually asserts, in substance, that if these things are proved to be *pure fictions*, the truth and authenticity of our faith will remain altogether unshaken and inviolate. We know not what Mr. Powell's faith

may be: but let him not implicate in such tenets the faith of other Christians.

But we stop. At this moment we intended only to state two things, the one, our assurance that Christianity will walk through this trial, as through every other, without hurt or blemish; the other, our conviction, nevertheless, that the question of physical science in its relation to the religion of Jesus Christ, is just the most important and the most difficult question, which, when we consider the spirit of the age, and the tenor of modern studies, the whole range of divine and human knowledge can present;—the very question, which requires to be handled with the nicest tact, the most delicate discretion, the most extensive information, the most cautious judgment. Was Dr. Nolan,—notwithstanding his acquirements, which are indisputably great,—quite the man to preach the Bampton Lectures before the University of Oxford on such a subject? And was Mr. Baden Powell quite the man to answer him? We really feel that the credit of the University is to a certain degree involved: and on this account it is, that we rose up from a rapid glance into these two publications, with more uncomfortable and distressing feelings, than we can possibly express. Dr. Nolan's publication is unsatisfactory:—but Mr. Baden Powell's is far worse than unsatisfactory. For his sake, we now waive the inquiry: for his sake, we postpone it until our next number. We trust, that, in the mean time, he will take some opportunity to retract, or at least modify his preposterous and heretical propositions. If he does neither, we shall be compelled to show the calamitous conclusions, to which his premises inevitably lead; and to speak of him and his school, in terms which we had hoped never to apply to a Savilian professor of Geometry; or a man, who had preached in St. Mary's pulpit at Oxford, and re-printed a sermon in reply to the Bampton Lectures; or, in short, to any class of *English Divines*, who had not openly seceded from the Established Church.

---

#### HISTORICAL DIVINITY.

*The Arians of the Fourth Century.* By J. H. Newman, M.A. London. Rivington and Co. 1833.

THIS is one of those learned and excellent works, which it may seem almost unjust to throw among a miscellany of notices: and we shall be glad, if we can find an opportunity, to give hereafter a more lengthened account of it. It deserves every eulogium both for erudition and judgment. We hope, not merely for Mr. Newman's sake, but for the sake of orthodox Christianity, that the same causes, which unfitted it for a place in "The Theological Library," may not operate to diminish its general circulation. But, unhappily, these are not days when deep inquiry and toilsome thought are much encouraged and appreciated.

---

**CONTROVERSIAL, EXEGETICAL, CRITICAL, AND PHILOLOGICAL  
WORKS.**

***Meek on the Errors of the Church of Rome.*** London. J. Hatchard and Son. 1834.

MR. MECK seems much more afraid of the progress of Popery in this island than we happen to be. But the question, whether the number of Roman Catholics is increasing in England and Scotland with a ratio beyond the general increase of the population, is one upon which we are unwilling to enter without sufficient data before us, or sufficient time carefully to weigh and examine them. At any rate, it must be well for the Protestant to understand the distinctive character of his own faith, and to be furnished with arms by which he may defend it. For this purpose he will find Mr. Meek's book of value and of service.

---

***Hulsean Lectures for the year 1832.*** By the Rev. J. J. Blunt. London. John Murray. 1833.

WE have great pleasure in recommending these lectures. They are full of honest, orthodox, sterling divinity: and, even where there could not be much novelty of matter, there is a manly and vigorous originality of tone. The style is racy and energetic rather than polished: it resembles a new strong wine—good and sound; but wanting the softness and mellowness which age might give it. Was it quite worth while to attack a popular History of the Jews from the University pulpit, and to bring so prominently forward, even for the sake of demolishing, the flimsy fabric of Mr. Milman's theories?

---

***Second Travels of an Irish Gentleman in Search of a Religion, with Notes and Illustrations.*** Not by the Editor of "Captain Rock's Memoirs." 2 vols. Dublin. Richard Milliken and Son. 1833.

WE dislike the principle of this book, which proceeds merely upon the alteration of another man's idea. Mr. Moore, in writing "The Travels of an Irish Gentleman in Search of a Religion," was quite out of his element, and quite out of his depth. But it is better to write a reply than an imitation. The work before us shows ability, and shows reading: but we much question its success; or rather, to use the author's not very felicitous phraseology, we should express this opinion, "*senza dubbio*, I mean without doubt."—p. 177.

---

1. ***Nine Sermons on the Trinity. Preached in Rostrevor Church.*** By the Rev. Edward John Evans, M.A. Vicar of Kilbrony. Dublin. William Curry, jun. and Co.; Simpkin and Marshall, London. 1833.
2. ***The Doctrine of the Trinity in Unity deduced, &c.*** By a Member of the Church of England. London. Rivington and Co. 1833.
3. ***Unitarian Christianity demonstrated from the Bible.*** By a late Student of the Dublin University. Third Edition. Hunter and Co. London; Shaw and Sons, Dublin.



4. *Deliverance from Evil, or Rational Mysticism explained.* London. R. Hunter. 1833.

HERE we have "bane and antidote" together. Mr. Evans, indeed, and his anonymous coadjutor, might overthrow more doughty antagonists than any whom they seem likely to meet. The Unitarian publications, which we have lately seen, are, with scarcely an exception, hardly worthy even of their own cause. Those before us are mere drivel: and we forget their venom in the complete consciousness of their impotence. It rejoices us to find, that, although among the members of Mechanics Institutes, and the smaller fry of philosophers, of little wit and no reading, Unitarianism may be making its miserable way, still the general talent and intellect of the country are altogether against it: and that even in our courts of law champions start up, most willing and most able to defend the cause of Trinitarian Christianity.

---

1. *Girdlestone on the Epistles to the Seven Churches of Asia.* London. Hatchard and Son. 1833.
2. *The Book of the Unveiling. An Exposition, with Notes.* London. Samuel Bagster. 1833. 4to.
3. *The Time of the End. A Series of Lectures on Prophetical Chronology.* By the Rev. W. A. Holmes, B. A. Chancellor of Cashel, &c. &c. &c. London. Seeley and Burnside.

HERE we have a collection of works upon subjects which have ever baffled human penetration. Mr. Girdlestone (*not* the Vicar of Sedgley) writes with more caution and prudence than the rest; but we cannot profess to be satisfied with his arguments. "The Book of the Unveiling," notwithstanding the affectation of the title, does not pretend to look into futurity. The other may either edify or divert the curious reader, who wishes to see it proved by five lines of demonstration, that the "Time of the End" is to be in 1836, although many other epochs have been ascertained as the final period by methods equally conclusive.

---

1. *Modern Claims to the Gifts of the Spirit.* By the Rev. William Goode, M.A. London. J. Hatchard and Son. 1833.
2. *Two Discourses upon the Trial of the Spirits.* By the Rev. Henry Blunt, Rector of Upper Chelsea. London. J. Hatchard and Son. 1833.

OF these two works, Mr. Goode's is a careful and convincing exposure of the claims to immediate inspiration put forth by some modern fanatics. He sets the Scriptural evidence upon the subject in a strong light: and he shows, from historical proofs, that there is nothing of novelty in the enthusiasts or impostors, with whom we are now pestered; but that there have been men in all ages, who have, in like manner,

"Play'd their fantastic tricks before high heav'n  
To make the angels weep."

The quotation may not be quite exact; but no matter. Mr. Blunt's sermons add little to the argument; but they display the pious and Christian spirit, characteristic of their truly excellent author. Of course, Mr. Blunt knows much better than we can know the circumstances by which he is surrounded: for ourselves, we should hardly have deemed it requisite to notice such frantic follies from the pulpit. Why speak in *unknown* tongues? why speak things, which, when interpreted, appear unworthy of inspiration, and even interpretation? But we fear that we are formed of less indulgent materials than Mr. Blunt. We can only say, that we look upon the pretensions of these men with an ineffable contempt; and upon the men themselves with an ineffable compassion.

---

*Christian Experience, as displayed in the Life and Writings of St. Paul.* By the Author of "Christian Retirement." Second Edition. London. Hamilton, Adams and Co. 1833.

A devout and agreeable production, which we can read with pleasure, even after Mr. Henry Blunt's admirable lectures upon nearly the same subject.

---

#### VOLUMES OF PRACTICAL DIVINITY.

*A Course of Sermons for the Year.* By the Rev. Johnson Grant, M.A. Rector of Binbrooke, &c. London: Rivington, Hatchard; Straker and Drew, Kentish Town. 1833. 10s. 6d.

THESE Sermons are replete with amiable feeling and pleasing language. Many readers, we dare say, would be charmed with them. To our taste they are somewhat deficient in the lofty qualities of fervour and strength; they seem to want *pith*; and they too often descend to the mere *prettinesses* of poetry. But we should not wish to be harsh, even if harshness were deserved, (and certainly it is not,) with so able and excellent a Minister of the Gospel as Mr. Grant has been for many years.

---

1. *Plain Discourses, Doctrinal and Practical, adapted to a Country Congregation.* By the Rev. Sir C. Hardinge, Bart. A.M. London: J. G. and F. Rivington. Vol. II. 1833.

2. *Family and Parochial Sermons.* By the Rev. W. Shepherd, Curate of Cheddington, Bucks. London: J. G. and F. Rivington.

3. *Sermons.* By the Rev. Richard Cattermole, B.D. London: B. Fellowes.

4. *The Better Covenant; a Series of Discourses.* By the Rev. Francis Goode, M.A. Lecturer of Clapham. London: Hatchard and Son. 1833.

OF these Sermons, which we put together because they may be all acceptable in their way, they who like a more copious and poetical diction will prefer Mr. Cattermole's; they, who like the tone which is called *Evangelical*, will prefer Mr. Goode's; and they, who like practical and homely Sermons, which may be useful in any family or parish, will prefer Sir C. Hardinge and Mr. Shepherd's.

## OCCASIONAL DISCOURSES AND TRACTS.

1. *Charge by the Right Rev. Henry Lord Bishop of Exeter, at his Primary Visitation.* John Murray. 1833.
2. *Dr. Skinner's Charge to the Clergy of his Diocese of Aberdeen.* Brown and Co.; Grant and Co., Edinburgh; Rivington, London. 1833.
3. *Rev. E. A. Bray's Sermon at the Visitation of the Archdeacon of Totness.* Rivington. 1833.

THE Bishop of Exeter's Charge is, as might be expected from him, able and eloquent; and traces a variety of topics with a masterly and rapid pencil. We are glad to find that he gives a very cheering account of the state of popular feeling, with respect to the Church, in his important and extensive Diocese. We believe indeed that in distant and rural districts the majority of the people are still attached to the doctrines and forms of the Established Church, and the persons of their spiritual guides; but we much fear, on the other side, that in vast and busy towns, such as London, and Birmingham, and Manchester, there is a party, formidable both from numerical strength and want of principle, composed of men who favour infidelity more than dissent—men with whom it will be found impossible to keep any terms—men who would be quite satisfied to see our Churches roofless, and our population unchristianized, and our Clergy beggars upon the face of the earth. On this account we have spoken of the proceedings in a particular parish of the metropolis, with perhaps more vehemence than the occasion might seem to require. But our censures are in some degree conjectural and conditional; and if we discover hereafter that we are mistaken, we shall acknowledge our error with more pleasure than we now express our indignation.

Dr. Skinner's Charge is sound and useful; but we cannot say that Mr. Bray's Sermon is much to our taste.

---

## CHARGES AND VISITATION SERMONS.

*National Apostacy considered, in a Sermon.* By John Keble, M.A. Oxford. printed by S. Collingwood. 1833.

MR. KEBLE'S Sermon is forcible and spirited; but the excellent author must of course expect that, to many persons, his very force and determination will be displeasing; and that many others will, while professing generally to agree with him, consider the tone which he has taken as occasionally deficient in moderation.

---

*The Nature and Necessity of a due Preparation for Death; a Sermon.* By the Rev. Thomas Harrison, M.A. Lecturer of St. Mary's Church, Chester. Chester, printed for John Seacome. 1833.

MR. HARRISON'S is one of the innumerable Discourses annually poured forth, which are very proper to be preached, but not of sufficient calibre to be published.

*Church Rates Lawful but not always expedient; a Sermon, &c.* By the Rev. Charles Girdlestone, M.A. Vicar of Sedgley, Staffordshire. London: J. G. and F. Rivington, Hatchard and Son, and L. B. Seeley and Sons. 1833.

MR. GIRDLESTONE hopes, by his numerous *brochures*, in this critical position of Ecclesiastical affairs, to do more or less of good; but we must think that he is unfortunate in the subjects which he selects, and the opportunities which he seizes. "Neither gods, nor men, nor columns," allow mediocrity to poetry; so Mr. Girdlestone may be assured that "neither gods, nor men, nor columns," nor any thing else, will allow any man to be on *both sides* when irritating or important subjects are discussed. A man may attach himself to neither party; he cannot attach himself to both. He might as well think to walk on both sides of the pavement at once, without stepping into the gutter between them.

---

GENERAL LITERATURE IN ITS CONNECTION WITH RELIGIOUS AND SOCIAL IMPROVEMENT.

*Social Evils, and their Remedy.* By the Rev. Charles B. Tayler, M.A. "The Mechanic." London: Smith, Elder and Co. Cornhill. 1833.

THE design of this work would have been good, if it had been original:—the execution is only *tolerable*. The want of these two great *desiderata*,—originality of plan and striking excellence of execution, appear to have been fatal to the undertaking. Mr. Tayler's intentions were, we have no doubt, excellent.

---

*The Oriental Annual, or Scenes in India; comprising Twenty-five Engravings from Original Drawings.* By William Daniell, M.A. And a Descriptive Account, by the Rev. Hobart Caunter, B.D. London: Published by Edward Bull, Holles Street, Cavendish Square. 1834.

A VOLUME quite gorgeous in its embellishments, and in its letter-press interesting, on many accounts, to the Biblical student and Christian reader. We should say more in its praise, if it had not already been so elaborately *bepuffed*.

---

*Lives of Sacred Poets.* Vol. I. By R. A. Willmott, Esq. of Trinity College, Cambridge. Published by Parker, Strand, under the Direction of the Committee of General Literature and Education.

UPON the hurried and imperfect perusal which we have been enabled to give to this book, we should say of it that it was composed with great elegance of style, and displays considerable research;—and affords much information, gathered from original sources, and not hitherto brought before the public view. It is indeed delightful to retire from the bustle and disquietude of the turbulent world to the study of such biography as this. Mr. Willmott writes of Christians in the spirit of a Christian, and of poets in the spirit of a poet.

## AMERICAN WORKS.

*A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews.* By the Rev. Moses Stuart, M. A. Re-published under the Care of E. Henderson. Doct. Philos. London: Fisher, R. Fisher and P. Jackson. 1833.

THIS is a truly valuable treatise, quite on a par with the same Author's Annotations upon the Epistle to the Romans. The preliminary matter in reply to the objections raised by German criticism, and in proof that the Epistle was written to the Hebrews and written by St. Paul, is excellent, and, we should almost say, conclusive. There are, of course, some few points, philological and exegetical, on which we differ from Mr. Stuart, for the field is vast and various; but we content ourselves with saying, that the work is most creditable to American piety and American scholarship. We fear that there are *very* few of our own divines who *could* have done it, or *would* have done it. The toil of really learned and laborious criticism is very irksome, and, with us, very ill-requited.

---

*The Rule of Faith. A Charge to the Clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Pennsylvania.* By the Right Rev. Henry W. Onderdonck, D.D. Assitant Bishop of the Diocese. Philadelphia. 1833.

*Convention Sermon, on the Relation of Christianity to Civil Government in the United States.* By the Rev. J. Adams, D.D. &c. &c. Charleston. 1833.

THESE also are two small publications which do credit to the literature and piety of the United States. They well deserve perusal, which we hope they will obtain. They well deserve quotation; which, unfortunately, we are unable to give.

---

WE reserve Dr. Wardlaw's Lectures on Christian Ethics and some other volumes for future examination; and in addition to the works which we have now specified, we might mention the Norrisian Prize Essay for 1832, by Mr. Myers, which is pains-taking and praise-worthy; and Mr. J. F. Russell's reply to Mr. Beverley's *slashing* libels against the Universities and Clergy of the land, which does him great credit on many accounts; and the argument *a priori* for the Being and Attributes of God, by William Gillespie; and a Concise View of the Prophecies relating to the Messiah, by William Webb Ellis, of Brasenose College, Oxford; and "Remarks on the Best Plans of School Education," by David Davison, M.A.; and a little book published by J. Vincent, at Oxford, entitled "*Seven Essays on the Social Condition of the Ancient Greeks*," which for the Scholar and the Christian possesses much interest, but which, we fear, is too learned and too classical for this utilitarian age.—But our space is exhausted.

## ERRATA.

Page 127, line 10 from bottom, after "Lincoln's Inn Fields" add London.

129, line 24, dele "very largely."

131, line 17, for "Editor" read Edition.

139, last line but one, for "second edition" read sixth.

# CONTENTS

OF

Nº. XXX.

---

	PAGE.
ART. I. Fanaticism. By the Author of "Natural History of Enthusiasm" . . . . .	241
II. 1. Sermons and Sketches of Sermons, by the late Rev. Hen. Gipps, LL.B. Vicar of St. Peter's and Rector of the United Parish of St. Owen, in the City of Hereford; revised, with some Introductory Remarks upon his Pulpit Ministry. By the Rev. J. A. Latrobe, M. A. sometime Curate of the said Parishes, and Chaplain to the Right Hon. Lord Mountsandford.	
2. Remarks on Party Distinctions in Religion; addressed to the Orthodox and Evangelical Clergy of the Church of England. By the Rev. J. B. James, B.C.L., M.D. F.L.S., of Queen's College, Cambridge, and Curate of Hanwell, Middlesex . . . . .	272
III. 1. Memoir of the late Right Reverend John Henry Hobart, D.D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the State of New York. By the Rev. William Berrian, D.D., Rector of Trinity Church, New York.	
2. Journal of the Proceedings of the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, held in the City of New York, from October 17 to October 31, 1832 . . . . .	280
IV. Christian Ethics; or Moral Philosophy on the Principles of Divine Revelation. By Ralph Wardlaw, D.D. .	313

- V. Principles of Geology; being an Attempt to Explain the former Changes of the Earth's Surface by Reference to Causes now in operation. By Charles Lyell, Esq. F.R.S. Professor of Geology to King's College, London . . . . . 334
- VI. Memoirs of the Life and Correspondence of the Rev. Christian Frederick Swartz; to which is prefixed a Sketch of the History of Christianity in India. By Hugh Pearson, D.D., M.R.A.S. Dean of Salisbury . 363
- VII. Diary of Ralph Thoresby, F.R.S., Author of the Topography of Leeds, (1677—1724.) Now first published from the original MS. By the Rev. Joseph Hunter, F.S.A.
2. Letters from Eminent Men addressed to Ralph Thoresby, F.R.S. Now first published from the Originals 393
- VIII. 1. The Analogy of Revelation and Science established, in a Series of Lectures delivered before the University of Oxford, in the year 1833, on the Foundation of the late Rev. John Bampton, M.A. Canon of Salisbury. By Frederick Nolan, LL.D. F.R.S. Vicar of Prittlewell, Essex, and formerly Student of Exeter College, Oxford.
2. Revelation and Science. By the Rev. Baden Powell, M.A. F.R.S., of Oriel College, Savilian Professor of Geometry.
3. The Cabinet Cyclopædia.—Natural Philosophy: An Historical View of the Progress of the Physical and Mathematical Sciences, from the earliest Ages to the present Times. By the Rev. Baden Powell, M.A. F.R.S., Savilian Professor of Geometry in the University of Oxford.
4. A Popular View of the Correspondency between the Mosaic Ritual and the Facts and Doctrines of the Christian Religion. In Nine Discourses. By the Rev. William Greswell, M.A., Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford, and Officiating Curate of Disney, Cheshire . 411



IX. 1. Rapport sur l'etat de l'Instruction Publique dans quelque Pays de l'Allemagne, et particulièrement en Prusse. Par M. V. Cousin, Conseiller d'Etat, Profes- seur de Philosophie, Membre de l'Institut et du Conseil Royal de l'Instruction Publique.	
2. Etat de l'Instruction Primaire. Par M. V. Cousin, Supplément a Rapport sur l'Instruction Publique, en Prusse.	
3. England and the English. By E. L. Bulwer, Esq., M.P.	
4. Annual Report of the National Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Established Church, throughout England and Wales, for 1832 and 1833.	
5. Report of the British and Foreign School Society to the General Meeting, May 10, 1830, with an Appen- dix.	
6. Annual Report of the Sunday School Union.	
7. A Sermon. By the Rev. John James Taylor.	
8. Works for the Promotion of Sunday Schools, by the Rev. J. C. Wigram, the Rev. J. Medley, the Rev. J. Hull.	
9. "The Teacher:" or Moral Influences employed in the Instruction of the Young; intended chiefly to assist young Teachers in organising and conducting their Schools. By Jacob Abbott, Principal of Mount Ver- non School. Revised by the Rev. Charles Mayo, LL.D. late Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford . . .	434

---

ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD . . . . .	497
---------------------------------	-----



THE  
BRITISH CRITIC,  
Quarterly Theological Review,  
AND  
ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

---

APRIL, 1834.

---

ART. I.—*Fanaticism*. By the Author of “Natural History of Enthusiasm. London: Holdsworth and Ball. 1833. 8vo. pp. 515.

WE must honestly confess that we sit down with feelings of unspeakable diffidence and perplexity to an examination of the topics involved in this treatise. Enthusiasm and Fanaticism are two very dark and awful departments of Mental Nosology. We freely acknowledge ourselves inadequate to the task of exploring them as their importance and their difficulty demands. Like all other regions of inquiry of which the nature of man is the subject—in its weakness and its strength, its rectitude and its aberrations—this seems to us to require an almost superhuman power of intuition; such as was possessed by Shakspeare alone, of all the sons of men who have left us any monuments of their genius. And then, too, we cannot help feeling that the task is one which further calls for some portion of that peculiar sagacity and experience which is to be attained nowhere but in the school of medical science. There can, we think, be little doubt that the case of the confirmed enthusiast, or fanatic, is a case of insanity. The degrees of intensity with which the disorder manifests itself may be infinitely various; and so likewise may be the symptoms which exercise the *diagnostic* or *prognostic* penetration of the observer. But still there must be more or less of madness in every instance of the kind which can be well imagined; of madness, which, if it apparently leaves the intellectual capacities tolerably undisturbed, produces a fearful and strange confusion of the moral faculties. And this interruption or destruction of the moral equilibrium is considered, we believe, by the highest medical authorities, to be one of the most certain indications of a diseased mind. We contend, therefore, that, in order to a consummate accomplishment of such a work as that before us, a certain measure of what may be called *professional* knowledge

should enter into the qualifications of the inquirer. If we were to image to ourselves a person adequately endowed for the task, it would be one who should be gifted by nature with a profound intuitive capacity—who should add to this gift a wide and various acquaintance with human nature as exhibited to us in biography and history—and who, lastly, should be personally, and (if we may so express it) *medically* familiar with all the sad and appalling phenomena of mental derangement.

It is true, indeed, that there are multitudes who act like enthusiasts or fanatics, without being such by virtue of their own personal and peculiar temperament. There is, doubtless, many a nature which is destitute of inherent energy sufficient to *engender*, of itself, either of these habits or dispositions; and which yet is capable of imbibing, by infection from other highly diseased minds, a tendency to the most ridiculous or the most pernicious extravagancies. The genuine enthusiast will often be surrounded by followers, to all appearance as wild and devious as himself, and who yet have, in their own nature, no elements which would ever have wrought themselves into commotion, or driven their possessor much awry from the line of sobriety. The fanatic, in like manner, is frequently able to stir the stagnant waters around him into furious agitation, and to give them the aspect and the force of a troubled ocean. Nothing can well be more melancholy and more oppressive than to look back upon the history of man, and there to see how the comparatively inert atoms of which the moral world is made up, have been often lashed into ruinous confusion by the breath of some mischievous and unquiet spirit, till they seemed to be themselves instinct with some tremendous principle of life. In examining, therefore, the history of these forms of madness, the inquirer must always be considered as having before him those cases, chiefly, which exhibit the generation and the working of the turbulent principle in minds of a peculiar order. It is here that the leading appearances must be sought. The movements of the inferior agents may fitly be regarded as forming a class of subordinate and residual phenomena; all of which will, indeed, be found to harmonize with the theory, if the theory be properly constructed, but which, of themselves, would scarcely be sufficient to conduct us to the true philosophy of the subject.

Respecting the fitness of the author for a work of this description, we have already expressed our judgment, in a former article of this journal.\* The writer is evidently a man† of ardent piety, of a vivid imagination, and of a vigorous and excursive understanding. He has a vast command of diction and of imagery—perfections

\* British Critic for Oct. 1830, Art. VI.—On the “Natural History of Enthusiasm.”

† Or Woman!—we know not which. The *performance* is masculine enough.

which sometimes betray him into their kindred vices. Whether he composes with facility, it is scarcely possible for us to ascertain. If he does, the result is such as to baffle all criticism. Any man who can write fluently in such a style, must himself be under the influence of something like *enthusiasm*. He is never dull. Dullness, indeed, is at the very antipodes of his manner. He *seems* to work, almost throughout, in a tone of mental orgasm. If the reader ever flags, it is not from the narcotic influence of the preparation, but from the exhaustion produced by long-continued excitement. There is, if we may so express it, an *intensity* about the composition, which keeps our faculties perpetually upon the stretch. All this indicates, no doubt, an abundance, almost a superfluity, of power; but still it leaves the reader under the impression that there has been an incessant effort put forth. The work *may* have been produced without throes and agonies;—but one cannot be sure of this from the perusal of it. The impression of most readers will probably be, that the process of production must have been severe and laborious. The man, beyond all question, is a very distinguished writer; but he is not of the number of those giants whose strength often appears most majestic in its repose.

We are rather inclined to doubt whether the present work will ever reach the popularity attained by the “Natural History of Enthusiasm.” Not that the writer is here below himself in power and execution, but that the subject of this treatise is less likely to fix the attention of the public. The elements of Enthusiasm are always afloat in greater or less abundance. It is true that they are a good deal neutralized or counteracted by the spirit which predominates in this arithmetical and scientific age. There is probably at this moment among us, an unusually large proportion of individuals whose brain is no more capable of enthusiasm, than a heap of saw-dust is capable of ignition. But the mass of incombustible material will never be sufficient to keep down altogether the inflammable tendencies which are constantly lurking in every community of human beings. Enthusiasm, in some form or other, will be perpetually bursting forth; sometimes in small and feeble explosions, at other times in fantastic and many-coloured flames, and occasionally with loud and alarming, but not perhaps very dangerous, eruption. Being, however, incessantly at work, it becomes of course an object of permanent attention, more especially to those who delight in the exercise of moral and intellectual analysis. But fanaticism has, at this time, less resemblance to a widely-diffused electrical fire, than to a volcano which has long ceased to rage. It *may*, indeed, burst forth once more. It may again vomit its torrents of lava, and spout upwards

its tempest of blazing fragments. No one can be certain that it has utterly burned out; but yet, no one is under the least alarm about the matter. And so, people build their houses, and plant their vineyards and their olive-yards, in the very midst of the ruins which, in by-gone generations, were made by the grim but silent monster in their neighbourhood. This we take to be very much the case with ourselves at the present day. We are under little more habitual dread of the fanatical spirit, than we are of the final conflagration of the world. We have among us, dreamers of dreams, and seers of visions, and wanderers in the land of unreal mockery, and dealers in a sort of spiritual *glamour*. But a genuine and confirmed fanatic is a prodigy which most people would stare at, and wonder how he had contrived to escape from Bedlam. And, as for any general convulsion, and upheaving of the frame of society, from the fierce energies of fanaticism, we of this country as little expect it, as we expect to see "castles toppling on their warders' heads;" or "palaces and pyramids sloping their tops to their foundations," from the action of an earthquake. For these reasons, any analysis of this turbulent principle is much less likely to excite the public mind, than an investigation of the more familiar phenomena considered in the former volume of this writer.

He appears, indeed, to be himself aware that all apprehensions from this quarter have long subsided. But he considers us as in a state of very dangerous security. He is under a strong impression that we are not entirely safe from an eruption from one day to another.

"If"—he says—"just at the present moment, there seems little or no probability that sanguinary and malignant superstitions should regain their lost ascendancy, can we say it is certain that no such evils, congruous as they are with the universal passions of man, shall henceforth be generated, and burst abroad? . . . . The supposition that human nature has for ever discarded certain powerful emotions, which, awhile ago, raged within its circle, must be deemed frivolous and absurd. How soon may we be taught to estimate more wisely the forces we have to guard against, in our political and religious speculations! The frigid indifference and levity we see around us, is but the fashion of a day; and a day may see it exchanged for the utmost extravagance, and for the highest frenzy of fanatical zeal. Human nature, let us be assured, is a more profound and boisterous element than we are apt to imagine, when it has happened to us for a length of time to stand upon the brink of the abyss, in a summer season, idly gazing upon the rippled surface,—gay in froth and sunbeams. What shall be the movements of the deep, and what the thunder of its rage, at nightfall, and when the winds are up?"—p. 16.

In another place he observes, that

"Little more than the trite surface of human nature meets the eye

among a people like ourselves. Our theories and systems of morals hardly take account of upper and lower instances, while they are busied with what may be found in the mid region of mixed and moderate passions. Living, as we do, in the meridian of caution and mediocrity,—history, when most faithful, often sounds like romance. Or, even if we give credit to its narration, we regard its lessons as of little practical significance now; inasmuch as whatever is violent or terrible has fallen, we think, from the usage of mankind. It has become somewhat difficult for us to place ourselves so far in sympathy with extreme emotions as is necessary for understanding them. In all things, what is profound has given way to what is familiar; or what once was fact, is now thought of only as a fit subject for fiction.”

And then he adds, undoubtedly with great truth, that “men of the present age are careworn oftener than melancholy; merry or jovial rather than joyous; sagacious or ingenious rather than meditative; and so keenly attached to the passing moment”—(and we might add, so incessantly grappled and buffeted by the harassing exigencies of the passing moment)—“as to throw up their interest as well in the past as the future.” All this is true,—most grievously true. We are, in sad and sober verity, a *careworn* generation. England, more especially, in spite of her wealth and her resources, we take to be the most *careworn* nation beneath the Sun! Our dreams are haunted, not by the Furies of rancorous Religionism, but by the harpies of the Law. We live in daily and hourly fear, not of the familiars of the Inquisition, but of the familiars of the Exchequer. Our musings are of taxgatherers, and attornies, and bailiffs. We are perpetually thinking how the wolf is to be kept from the door. Our talk is of poor laws, and of corn laws, and of free trade, and of currency. We are deep in the mysteries of utility and expediency. We are, moreover, in the midst of a heaving ocean of desperate pauperism: and are watching, in an agony of terror, for the moment when the tide shall rise up, till “our lips drink the bitter brine.” We are, in short, more or less deeply immersed in anxieties at once the most grovelling and the most tormenting. And all this while, there is “a spirit of raillery” abroad among the classes who are comparatively at ease; a mocking and sneering devil, who withers with a glance all high and cordial emotion. In those quarters there prevails an influence, in the midst of which passion and energy quietly die away. If any thing, therefore, like “demoniac frenzy” should rush forth, in a generation like this, it may be expected to issue from the regions where popular discontent is in dark and secret fermentation, rather than from the depths of religious and spiritual emotion. But, in spite of all this, the author bids us to beware.

“Galerius, Alva, Bonner”—he tells us—“cross our path in every



street of a populous city; and, moreover, the agents and ministers of such formidable personages might be found in every crowd. The chief and his company, fit for the labours of religious cruelty, we must not think have passed away with ages long gone by; but rather believe that they are about us now, and wait only the leave or bidding of circumstances to re-act their parts."—"Justice, therefore, toward the signalized authors of persecution, whom we are apt to regard as beings of infernal origin,—and a due caution, having respect to the possible events of some day which may yet come in the world's history,—demand that, instead of taking a distant glance at the gloomy tragedies of remote times, we should look into the heart, in search of those deep sunken motives, whence the worst atrocities might take their spring."—pp. 144, 145.

Without pretending to be *very* deeply infected with the apprehensive caution of the writer, we must profess ourselves unable confidently to gainsay his dark vaticinations. What the world has seen, the world may see again. The nature of man has undergone, as yet, no radical and universal change. The ferocious and sanguinary passions, which, in time past, went forth upon Crusades, or laboured at the establishment of Inquisitions, *may* unhappily revisit the earth, and convert it into a habitation fit for every unclean and hateful spirit. And besides, if the voice of experience cannot be slighted with impunity, still more perilous is it to disregard the sure word of prophecy; which seems to announce a period of awful havoc and convulsion, as preparatory to the final establishment of Christ's visible dominion over all the earth. And who shall presume to say what fierce and malignant agencies shall mix themselves in the conflict, when the day of that dreadful arbitrement shall arrive?—We, therefore, so far acquiesce in the views and feelings of the author, as willingly to attend him in his contemplation of those infernal shadows, which, heretofore, have passed over the orb of our pure faith; and which almost remind us of the season when there should be signs in the heaven above, and the earth beneath, blood, and fire, and vapour of smoke; when the sun should be turned into darkness and the moon into blood.\*

*Fanaticism*, then, according to this writer, is "*Enthusiasm* inflamed by hatred." (p. 50.) It, therefore, becomes necessary that we should first be in possession of the meaning which he attaches to the word *Enthusiasm*. His former volume left us somewhat at a loss on this point. He has, now, been at considerable pains to relieve us from our perplexity. After some very needless discussion, touching the absurdity of a pedantic reference to the sense which the term *enthusiasm* may have borne in the minds of Lucian or Plutarch, Epictetus or Aristotle, he tells us that, in his former treatise

\* Acts, ii. 19, 20.

tise, "spurious and imaginative religious emotions were spoken of: and that his present task is to describe the various combinations of the same spurious pietism, with the malign passions." We have, accordingly, the advantage of setting out with something like a distinct perception of what he purposes to describe and to illustrate. The religious Enthusiast—if we understand him correctly—is one in whose mental and spiritual economy the imaginative faculty exercises an undue predominance: and the fanatic is one in whom the enthusiastic disposition is, somehow or other, wrought up into a rancorous and malignant temper. This definition, it will immediately be perceived, harmonizes sufficiently with a vast variety of phenomena. The ingredients of the fanatical temper may be combined in every imaginable proportion. In so far as the power of Imagination prevails over the sober faculty of Reason, the man is an Enthusiast: and again, according to the strength or abundance of the unsocial or malevolent infusion, he becomes a fanatic of greater or less intensity. If the powers of reason be naturally weak, a very trifling predominance of the imaginative faculty may be enough to disturb or to overrule it; and then we have an instance of enthusiasm, indeed, but enthusiasm of a weak and languid type; of a disposition which naturally makes its victim the prey and the sport of Enthusiasts who belong to a more turbulent and fiery class. And so of Fanaticism. It may be more or less diluted, according to the proportion of the burning or acrimonious ingredient.

Fanaticism, in short, may be considered as the religious principle, in the last stage which it can reach, when once it has gone beyond its proper condition of maturity. If, in this world, it could reach this enviable state of ripeness, and could there remain, we should have no such thing as visionary, or rancorous religion. But alas! the elements in which Piety must live, and move, and have its being, on earth, are sadly unfavourable to its preservation in this condition. It is too frequently urged on, by their influence, to an ulterior process. What may be called the *saccharine* combination is too apt to be followed by another, of a different description. To the mildness and the sweetness, there often succeeds a fiery and intoxicating quality: and then we have the *new wine* of Enthusiasm. If circumstances should be favourable, this product may possibly endure for a long period, without material change. It may even become mellow by the lapse of time. But if the external influences should be fierce and sultry, there *may* follow, and there often has followed, another fermentation: and the result is, a sour, acrid, corrosive compound, of which the best that can be said is, that its effect may be antiseptic. It may possibly preserve the heart from the corruption incident to

a state of spiritual apathy. It may possibly cure the soul of its indolent tumours, or its *putrefying sores*. But even if it should remedy one class of maladies, it may introduce another equally fatal. It may eat out the very heart of benevolence and humanity. It may turn the milk of human kindness to gall. It may convert the very life-blood of the spirit into the *poison of asps*.

According to the analysis of this writer, the elements of Fanaticism are three: 1. The supposition of malignity on the part of the object of religious worship.—2. A consequent detestation of mankind, as the subjects of a malignant Power.—And then, 3. A credulous conceit of the favour of heaven shown to a few, in contempt of the rules of virtue. (p. 86.)

“The fanatic, therefore,” says the author, “is much in error, but *let it not be thought that he subverts the first principles of virtue*. His error is to impute an intrinsic malignity, or a sheer vindictive purpose to the Invisible Authority: and then he conceives of himself as having, by his transgressions, fallen into the hands of the irresistible Avenger; who, as he thinks, can take advantage of mankind only so far as sin brings them within the circle of his wrath; or who, once and again, starts forth, and catches an opportunity against men, when he finds them unwary or at fault.”—p. 98.

It appears to us that this account of the matter ought to be received with very considerable caution. In the first place, although the error of the fanatic, as here described, may not involve, positively and directly, any “*subversion of the first principles of virtue*,” it assuredly does that which essentially amounts to the same thing. It is true, that he may not *begin* by trampling upon *all* distinction between right and wrong: but he *does* begin by ascribing a false and odious character to that Being, whose will is to be the standard by which all human actions must be tried and measured. His error is, therefore, one which corrupts and poisons the very fountain of all virtue. “What must be the priest, where a monkey is the god?” What must be the worshipper, where the object of his adoration is no better than a fiend? What must become of “the first principles of virtue” among men, when the Deity whom they serve is not a God “who loveth righteousness, and hateth iniquity,” but one who considers iniquity as a trap, or pitfall, into which the unwary may be betrayed at every step, and so may fall, like a prey, within the gripe of his malignity? What could remain on earth to deserve the name of virtue, if He who sitteth on the throne were not animated with the spirit of a righteous judge, but were to carry with him to the judgment-seat the low and treacherous craft of an informer, and the callous inhumanity of a public executioner? What, in short, would become of the “first principles of virtue,”

if mankind were to be worshippers of the devil? The only effect of such a religion must be that, like the devils, men would believe and tremble. There could then be no such thing as obedience *for conscience' sake*. All obedience would be from the fear of falling into the hands of a power that delighted in the infliction of torment. Whatever *virtue* there might be in the world, would very much resemble the honesty of a man who is impelled to pay his debts solely by his apprehension of a lawyer's letter; or the public spirit of a man who should be induced to pay his taxes only by salutary meditation on his Majesty's writ of extent; or the benevolence of a man who should be withheld from murder only by the prospect of the gallows. A faith like this would, in truth, be neither more nor less than a negation of all morality. In other words, it would, most effectually, *subvert* all moral principles.

In the second place, we very much doubt whether *Christian* fanaticism, in its origin, is rightly ascribed to a belief in the malevolence of the Deity. That a persuasion of this kind prevailed, with greater or less intensity, in the days of Paganism, is indeed beyond all doubt. The Supreme Being was then often regarded as a grudging and envious Power, that looked with evil eye on the enjoyments of men, and with apathy, if not with positive satisfaction, on their sufferings. And to this day, as the author observes, a similar belief, in its most preposterous extremity, may perhaps be met with on the banks of the Ganges, or in the wilds of Africa. But it may be gravely questioned whether the fanaticism which has, at times, defaced and blotted the lustre of Christianity, can be said to have *set out* with any such persuasion. One can easily imagine how a man, whose temperament is saturnine, and whose moral sense is, at the same time keen, may gradually degenerate into an unsparing censor, or even an unrelenting persecutor, without seeking for the *origin* of his perversions in any notions blasphemously dishonourable to his God. It is by no means very unnatural that a person, thus physically and morally constituted, should have his thoughts perpetually arrested by the picture of the Deity, exhibited by Revelation, as the God to whom righteous vengeance belongeth. The meditations of such a man may easily be conceived to take a course something like this:—"It is true that God is benevolent to all. It is true that He is the Father of all mercies, gracious and compassionate, slow to anger, and repenteth him of the evil. But then it is also true that even He, perfect as He is in goodness, cannot, or, at all events, does not, carry on the moral economy of the world without stupendous rigour. What, then, are they who call themselves his servants, that they should adopt

or countenance a different and more indulgent rule, than that which manifestly prevails throughout the whole scheme of the Divine Government? In what light can they regard the man whose doctrines are in contradiction to God's word, and whose lives are in opposition to his will? Must not such men be considered and treated as rebels against his just authority? Must they not be stigmatized and pursued as enemies to their brethren, whose immortal souls are endangered by the pestilence of their teaching, or their example? And is not this a case in which indulgence to man is treason against the Majesty of heaven?" Every sane mind will perceive, in an instant, the prodigious obliquity of such a train of thought. And every one can see, too, that its tendency is towards the direst excesses of fanaticism. But surely it cannot be said that the perversion, monstrous as it is, necessarily involves a belief that the Ruler of the world is essentially vindictive and malevolent. It, in fact, involves nothing, save, in the first place, a persuasion that, by some occult and mysterious union, the severity of God is indissolubly bound up with his goodness; and, secondly, an erroneous impression that men are quite as much bound to make the wrath of God the object of their imitation as his benevolence and holiness.

It is not to be denied that the habit of perpetually contemplating the more stern and awful attributes of the Deity may, in the end, produce much of the very same effect that would result from a belief that sheer malignity formed a part of His nature. A man may fix his thoughts upon the heavier dispensations of Providence till he has no eye for the milder exhibitions of the Divine beneficence. He may ponder, as Augustine has somewhere remarked, upon the mysterious predominance of evil, till he can discern nothing but evil. He may tremble at the threatenings of God's righteous displeasure, till he has lost the power of dwelling upon his promises of mercy. He may, in short, lose himself in the clouds and darkness which form the tabernacle of the Almighty, till his soul is strangely enamoured with the gloom, so that it can derive no comfort from the serenity and brightness which dwell within. And when his spirit is thus unhappily overcast, the man will probably come forth into the world in a temper of coldness and unfriendliness against his species. He may even be tempted to regard by far the greater portion of them as a miserable and foredoomed race, whose righteous lot it must be to drain to the very dregs *the wine-cup* of the fury of the Lord. He may talk, indeed, of the love and the compassion of God; but his words will be almost without meaning. In his mouth, they will be little more than certain conventional theological phrases, which find no echo in his heart. He

is profoundly in earnest only when he is enlarging on the *indignation and wrath, the tribulation and anguish*, reserved for *every soul of man that doeth evil*. And then, perceiving that his fulminations, for the most part, roll unheeded over the heads of the stupid and godless multitude, his vexation becomes gradually virulent and rancorous. His sympathies are estranged from a race who seem lost and dead in trespasses and sins. Why should a man care for them on whom the curse of judicial blindness hath come down? "Why should any one have a thought of compassion towards them that despise the compassion of God? If they be hardened in their way, shall we join with you against Him? Shall we prefer you above his glory? Nay, God forbid! We hope to *rejoice* in seeing all that vengeance and indignation poured out, unto all eternity, upon their souls."\* Now when a man is in a state to utter language like this, he is, to all intents and purposes, a fanatic, however guiltless he may be of imputing malignant dispositions to the Deity. And what will be the next stage of this odious frenzy, (unless it be checked by external circumstances, or the general prevalence of better feelings,) but a credulous conceit of the favour of heaven, shown to the few who are faithful to the inflexible justice and majesty of Heaven? And, lastly, when this *conceit* has fairly got possession of the brain,—when the *favour of Heaven* has once been secured,—how poor is the chance which remains for the "rules of virtue," the beggarly rudiments of the moral law! Why should the approved and faithful servant of God waste his energies in a petty contest against the vulgar frailties of flesh or spirit? He has earned his exemption from the toils of this poor and puny warfare. He is fighting the battles of the Lord against His avowed and open adversaries. He is, as it were, a public and consecrated man. In his own individual person, the assaults of earthly passion are not worth the trouble of resistance. The leader of an army may be himself a Sybarite, if he can but inspire his followers with a contempt of hardship, and toil, and privation. And, even so, the spiritual commander may be a profligate and a voluptuary, or an example of any vice or corruption under heaven; but what of that? He is still a chosen instrument for arraying the host of the faithful against the adversaries of the living God! And thus it is that, by a circuitous descent, a man may gradually come down, as many have come down, from the loftiest eminences of austere virtue, to the lowest and murkiest depths of ferocity and sensuality.

---

\* This is actually the language of Owen in his *Exposition of the 130th Psalm*, p. 310. Ed. 1772.



So much for fanaticism in general. We now come to the most conspicuous varieties in it, as exhibited by the author, under four principal designations, which we leave him to describe in his own words :

“ The first of these will comprehend all instances wherein malignant religious sentiments turn inward upon the unhappy subject of them : to the second class will belong that more virulent sort of fanaticism which looks abroad for its victims : the third embraces the combination of intemperate religious zeal with military sentiments, or with national pride, and the love of power : to the fourth class must be reserved all instances of the more intellectual kind, and which stand connected with opinion and dogma. Our first sort then is Austere ; the second Cruel ; the third Ambitious ; and the fourth Factionous.

“ Or, for the purpose of fixing a characteristic mark upon each of our classes, as above named, let it be permitted us to entitle them as follows—namely, the *first*, The Fanaticism of the SCOURGE ; or of personal infliction : the *second*, the Fanaticism of the BRAND ; or of immolation and cruelty : the *third*, the Fanaticism of the BANNER ; or of ambition and conquest : and the *fourth*, the Fanaticism of the SYMBOL ; or of creeds, dogmatism, and ecclesiastical virulence.”

The first of the above varieties, the Fanaticism of self-infliction, would seem to admit of a sufficiently simple explanation, when traced to its original. The New Testament abounds in precepts which represent self-denial as almost the life and soul of Christianity. The Christian is to take up his cross. He is to mortify the flesh. He is to pluck out the offending eye, and to cut off the offending hand. He is to die unto sin, and to live only unto righteousness. The world is to be crucified unto him, and he unto the world. His whole life is to be a state of incessant warfare. He must be prepared, at all times, to resist unto blood. Nothing, then, that he can do or suffer, will ever be too much. The mind which was in Christ Jesus, must likewise be in him. The imitation of his Saviour must be the great business of his life. He must purify himself, even as Christ was pure. It is only through much tribulation that he can enter into the kingdom of Christ. It is only through sufferings that he can be made perfect. For him, therefore, the world must be no place of enjoyment. All its pleasures are no better than snares. Marriage itself is but a dangerous concession to the passions. For though the Apostle has pronounced it to be honourable in all, yet the same Apostle has given a formidable description of its perils and embarrassments. He has said that it is good for a man not to touch a woman ; and has declared it to be his desire, that all could be, in this respect, even as he was himself. Now we have only to conceive a very conscientious and very injudicious man



brooding incessantly over such thoughts as these; and then we shall be, at once, in possession of the rise and progress of all manner of ascetic extravagance and absurdity. "The flesh," such a person may say, "must be subdued. But I cannot subdue the flesh, if I am to remain in the midst of the world, where all the lusts of the flesh are in riotous predominance. What then can I do but retire from the world and live in solitude; far remote from sights and sounds which may awaken the offending Adam within me." To solitude, then, he retires. But, alas! the offending Adam pursues him to his hermitage or his cell. What, then, is to be done? The flesh, in order to be subdued, must be positively crucified. And how is this to be effected, but by fastings, and by macerations, and by watchings; and if these are not sufficient for the purpose, by cold and nakedness; or by hair shirts, and iron girdles, and tormenting penances, and merciless flagellations. Again, "Matrimony," the same individual will probably say, "may be a very holy and honourable state. But, for my own part, I am unable to reconcile it with those exalted notions of purity which enter into the perfection of the Christian's character. At all events, it is a state of awful responsibility, and incessant distraction. I should despair, if engaged in it, of fixing my thoughts on things above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God. The best thing is to keep clear of it altogether. There will then be some fair chance, at least, of escaping from the cares which so often pierce men to the very soul, and which frequently drown them in destruction and perdition. Surely it cannot be otherwise than wise and safe to embrace the condition which an Apostle has pronounced to be of all others the most desirable." We have here a course of reflection which might easily pass through the minds of men intent upon the attainment of Christian perfection. No one, to be sure, can be at a loss in exposing its absurdity. But yet, no one is to be envied who can look, without respect, and even veneration, on the motives which give birth to such unearthly imaginings. We agree most cordially with the author, in considering all such struggles against the earthly parts of our nature as manifest indications of an immortal principle within us. Feelings like these could never arise in the bosom of a creature who was not conscious of a destiny which stretches out beyond the boundaries of this "visible diurnal sphere." But still it must be obvious that, when once such notions have got possession of the brain, there is, literally, no end to the perversions and extravagancies that may follow. The spasmodic heavings of human nature against the *peine forte et dure*, laid upon it by a tyrannical system; the corrosive action of the mind upon itself, when the passions and

affections are forbidden to go forth upon external objects; the ceaseless computation of the precise amount of self-restraint and torment which may be needful, as it were, to *fill up, in the flesh, that which is yet behind in the afflictions of Christ*;\* the growing contempt for the frivolous or sensual multitudes, who live carelessly and at ease, and who know nothing of the daily death which is undergone by the faithful servants of God; and, lastly, the secret pride with which the swelling accumulation of conscientious and voluntary suffering may at length be contemplated by the unsocial man,—all these may work together, in various proportions and degrees, till the ascetic becomes alienated in heart from his fellow men. And then it is that the gall distils into his soul. Then it is that a suffusion of virulence and rancour spreads itself imperceptibly throughout his whole mental and moral temperament. And thus it is that, in some natures, the comparatively mild ingredients of superstition or enthusiasm, may gradually ferment into the most acrid and venomous Fanaticism.

The author's analysis of the matter is considerably more elaborate than the above. He imagines, in the first place, that there are some natures too proud and stubborn to endure that misery should hunt them, and overtake them, and grapple with them, and bring them down. No—they are resolved to turn and face it. And not only so; they are determined to meet it half way. Whether we will, or whether we will not, the bread of adversity and the water of affliction must be our inevitable portion in this world. Is it not, then, a braver and a wiser thing to seize the bitter preparation, and to swallow it with desperate courage, than forcibly to be drenched with it, like an unreasoning brute. If pain and sorrow are to be the lot of man, why should he stand shivering at the brink, instead of plunging at once into the element, in which, sooner or later, he must be immersed, in spite of his reluctance and his terror? If this life is to be no better than a long discipline of Misery, why should we delay to frequent her school, until ease and self-indulgence have unfitted us for hardship and endurance? If wrath must go forth against us, why should we heap it up, by putting off the evil day? Why should we render the burden, which must fall upon us, utterly intolerable, by a course of feeble and cowardly hesitation, which, in the end, will only relax our knees, and prepare us to be crushed under the load? Let us, therefore, “daily converse with ghastly despair, and nullify fear by familiarity.” We certainly cannot undertake to say that there may

\* Coloss. i. 24.

not have been such modes of thought and feeling. Something of the same kind has, undoubtedly, been exemplified in the history of suicide. Men have been known to kill themselves, purely from the fear of death! And, again, we remember to have read, (somewhere, we believe, in the writings of Jeremy Taylor,) of a Polish schoolmaster, *Petrus Ilosuanus* by name, who had well nigh crazed himself by perpetual meditation on the Divine Decrees, till he became "weary of conjectures." He accordingly laid violent hands upon himself, in order that he might rush, at once, into those eternal fires, which he believed to have been prepared for himself, and the apprehension of which he found too horrible to be borne. A similar impatience of suspense, or a similar resolution to dare and defy the worst, may possibly have driven many into a course of the most frightful austerities. This sort of "desperate and sullen pride" may possibly be found at this day among the insane devotees of Hindostan. And the peculiar studies of the author may also have enabled him to discover distinct traces of the same temper, in the history of those forms of Fanaticism which emerged out of the corruption of the Gospel. We believe, with him, that the secrets of the monastic prison-house, if they could be fully explored, would disclose many a tale which would harrow up the soul, and freeze the blood, and bewilder the understanding. But still we have considerable doubts whether the element, which he believes himself to have detected, has ever entered very largely, or very generally, into the virulent religionism of the cloister. We apprehend that many of its most prodigious phenomena may be reasonably accounted for, without having recourse to any such hypothesis.

But, secondly,—“a consciousness of guilt, and a dread of retribution,” are much more common ingredients in the composition of the fanatic, than that which we have just been considering. They naturally prompt the self-condemned culprit to self-inflicted severities. And, here, we may remark, that a certain dash of crafty and world-like wisdom is sometimes apt to mix itself up with the most frantic extravagance. The conscious sinner, as the author truly says, “would fain take the engine of retributive torment into his own hand, lest it should be laid hold of by the Vindictive Power he dreads. And the hope he entertains of acting always as proxy for the minister of justice in his own case, bears proportion to the rigour with which he exercises the function of executioner.” But nevertheless, it has been occasionally found that the arrangement is not altogether to the disadvantage of the penitent. When he has got the Scourge into his own grasp, he will be strongly tempted to put a full value upon every stripe. He will be secretly impelled to institute a scale of com-

mutation which, if it does not do a great deal for the relief of his sinful body, may yet be, eventually, much in favour of his soul. If, for instance, a thousand or two of vigorous lashes, can clear off from the debtor side of his account one whole year of ceaseless and unspeakable agony in the Purgatorial fire,—the bargain, after all, will not be a very bad one for the sufferer. And every one knows that this sort of compromise is extremely prevalent in the spiritual arithmetic of the Romish Church. Still, even though the dividend should be small, under this system of composition, when compared with the full amount which might be rigorously exacted, it is absolutely wonderful that human fortitude should be equal to the voluntary payment of it, day after day, and year after year. “What spectacle in nature can be so monstrous, what at first sight so inexplicable, as that of an excruciated devotee, who scorns even to writhe or to sigh under tortures, which other men would not endure for an hour, to save or to obtain a mountain of gold?” And how much more astounding is it, that pride should, sometimes, continue the payment, which was first exacted by a stricken conscience, even after it may be presumed that, according to the accredited mode of reckoning, the debt has been fairly liquidated? And yet this is even so. There is something in spontaneous suffering which seems to give tenfold value to every pang. The voluntary martyr comes at length to a point, at which he seems to himself strong enough almost to defy the vengeance of heaven. From thenceforward every step “over the burning marle” carries him beyond the claim of his incensed adversary, and sets him forward on the high road, not only of security, but of honour and of merit. And then his spirit begins to soar upwards, and to vaunt itself in all the pomp, and magnificence, and prodigality, of wretchedness. “Must we not mourn”—asks the writer—“over the infatuations of our nature, as we watch the ascent of the soul that climbs towards the sky, only to carry there a sullen defiance of eternal justice.” And then followeth a simile—a very forced and vile one in our opinion—but which we give the reader as a specimen of the author’s style, when he is hovering, as he sometimes does, in the debateable region between the sublime and the ridiculous: “So the bird of prey, beat off from the fold, and torn with the shepherd’s shafts,—its plumage ruffled and stained with gore,—flaps the wing on high, and fronts the sun, as if to boast before heaven of its audacity and its wounds.” (p. 101.)

But how shall we describe the next change which, in many an instance, has been known to come over the spirit of the starved, and overwatched, and scourged, and tortured ascetic? How is it that the man whose flesh had been eaten into by the leathern

girdle round his loins, and who, yet, never betrayed the anguish by groan, or by gesture, or by look,—how is it that he who could abstract his soul from all sense of pain, and thus show himself the conqueror of nature,—how is it that he should slide down from the loftiest eminence of religious heroism, to the vilest of all debasement,—that of religious knavery? Who is there that can trace the obscure, and tortuous, and, as it were, subterraneous path of this melancholy descent? It is notorious that, in the East, self-torture is, frequently, a sort of *charlatanerie*, which is taken up by many as a regular calling or profession: and there the practitioners are, from the first moment of their career to the last, the same unchanged characters. They do not reach their debasement by a regular course of degeneracy. They are, throughout, consistently following their vocation. And they have their reward in the staring wonderment and stupid veneration of the ignorant multitude. But what are we to say to the cases recorded in the annals of Christian monkery?—to cases, in which the power of lofty, though perverted, sentiments, has domineered over the sollicitings of the flesh, and silenced the pleading of agonized nerves and quivering fibres,—and where all this has ended in the subjection of the man to motives but little better than those which actuate a common mountebank? How, in short, are we to account for any of the various instances, in which men have begun as enthusiasts, and ended as impostors? It has not been our fortune ever to meet with any thing that approaches to a clear solution of this strange and awful class of phenomena. The author has made some attempt at an explanation. (p. 105.) But, in truth, he has, after all, done little more than state the fact. The religious hero, he tells us, becomes the prey of vanity and ambition: and vanity and ambition quickly sap the more imaginative and passionate emotions: and the substitution of ignoble sentiments for those of the deeper sort, meets us every day; and thus it is that the sincere enthusiast becomes at length a dealer in religious, or rather, in superstitious craft. And again,—“Religious delusion”—he says—“is, in fact, found to coalesce readily, on the one hand, with soft sensualities, and, on the other,—strange amalgam!—with mercenary calculations. Oftener than can be told has pious heroism slid down, by a rapid descent, into sordid hypocrisy; and the stalking devotee of yesterday, has become, to day, a sheer knave.” This may be all true enough; but nobody is much the wiser for the statement of it. And we do not apprehend that the philosophy of the matter will be made much plainer by the following rhetorical illustration: “Just so does a torrent tumble from crag to crag of the mountains, and sparkle in the sun, as it storms along: until reaching a level and a slimy bed,

it takes up the impurity it finds; gets sluggish as well as foul; and at length creeps silent through the oozy channels of a swamp." This is ingenious and striking enough. But it does not go to the essence of the difficulty; which difficulty is, to explain how the moral, or spiritual *torrent*, ever reaches its bed of slime and mud; or, in plain language, how it is that any one, who, for a great portion of his life, has been conversant with exalted, though mistaken motives of action, should, at any time, so utterly forget them, as to surrender himself to impulses which direct the most despicable of mankind. We do not quarrel with the author for having failed to elucidate this mystery: for it is no disgrace to fail where no other human being has succeeded. For ourselves, we are disposed to regard such ignominious revolutions of character, as examples of the retribution which Nature, or rather the God of Nature, inflicts, wherever violence has been done to the ordinances and principles of the human constitution, whether physical or moral. It is impossible to violate the laws of our nature with impunity. They will always, in some mode or other, vindicate themselves. And if the assault upon them should be carried on with obstinacy and perseverance, some monstrous result may, almost certainly, be anticipated. We may be unable either to predict, or to trace, the consequences. No person can foretel, with entire certainty, all the effects of an unnatural regimen on the body. It will operate in a thousand various ways, according to the various temperaments of individuals. And so it is with the mind. An unnatural diet or discipline may produce something analogous to dropsy, or to fever, in the moral and intellectual habit. At all events there will be a derangement of some kind or other. And, as we have already observed, this derangement is just as likely to affect the moral as the rational powers. It often affects them both, in various degrees. The enthusiast is a madman. The fanatic is either a gloomy or a raving madman. The religious impostor and *charlatan* is a crafty maniac: for cunning is a quality which is often most copiously developed in the progress of mental derangement. And the origin of the whole is very generally to be sought in the indulgence of some inordinate propensity, or the application of some erroneous discipline. This exposition of the matter may, possibly, seem vague and unsatisfactory enough. We shall be deeply thankful to any one who will investigate the matter more closely and more successfully.

The accumulation of a vast fund of superfluous merit is the last exploit achieved by the genius of austere fanaticism. The process is somewhat similar to that by which a man, who begins life overwhelmed with incumbrances, takes up the habits of a



miser, and ends, not only with a clear estate, but with inordinate wealth to boot. In one respect, however, the parallel fails. The spiritual capitalist is sometimes generous, sometimes even ostentatiously prodigal. He is now a prosperous man. All fear of poverty is removed. He has enough to spare, out of his abundance, for them that need. Hundreds of indigent souls become dependent upon him. His expenditure, therefore, must be enormous; too great, perhaps, to admit of a relaxation of his severe and self-denying practices. The fund must, at all events, be kept up to its full amount. He has now, however, a new and powerful set of motives. In the first place, the necessitous must not be left to perish. And, secondly, the influence and the grandeur which surround the master of so much disposable treasure, is far too gratifying to be easily abandoned. The course of self-infliction is, accordingly, continued. Habit has made it comparatively easy. The consciousness of high beneficence, and the secret love of power, now render it positively delightful. The result is well known. The Western Church was, for ages, furnished with stupendous reservoirs of vicarious responsibility; and a race of emaciated, crazy, self-tortured enthusiasts, became, in effect, the dispensers of salvation!

Perhaps no false or corrupt religion which the world has ever seen, has been without its system of penances and austerities. The nearest approach to an exception is to be found in the religion of Mohammed. But the reason is obvious, and has been justly stated by the author. The personal austerities exacted of the Mussulman were to be practised on the scene of mortal strife. The camp was to him what the cloister was to the recluse of Christendom. It was there that an ample vent was found for those feelings which armed the Monk or the Saint against his own flesh. The child of Islam was by his very profession a warrior. Mohammedanism was, in fact, an *armed mission*; and every individual soldier was a missionary. Cowls, and hair-shirts, and leathern girdles, were not wanted, where every man was to pass his life in the harness of war; and was to count hunger, and thirst, and hardship, and death itself, as nothing. The apparatus of solitary self-infliction was needless, when Paradise was to be won, not in the cell, but in the field.

With regard to that most portentous delusion, the Judaism of the Talmud, it is well known that it has penances enough! Some of them are enumerated by the author; and there is about them,—as there is about almost every thing Rabbinical—an air of such childish, grotesque, and monstrous extravagance, that one would imagine they must have been dictated by a resolution to outdo all the rest of mankind in absurdity. The penitent, in certain



specified cases, is to sit naked in an ant's nest; or he is to break the ice, and plunge himself into the freezing water up to his nostrils, and there to remain for a space of time sufficient for the boiling of an egg, or in graver cases for an hour together, twice every day; or he is to fast for forty days continuously; or, in the summer months, he is to expose himself to flies and bees and wasps. If we are not mistaken in our recollection, Lightfoot somewhere produces an instance of a Rabbi, who was found voluntarily enduring penal torments, inflicted by venomous or voracious insects on his flesh; and, on being asked what was the sin for which he was suffering, replied that he had, some time since, omitted to give a penny to a beggar! It never occurred to the worthy man that the affair might have been much more rationally settled by giving five or ten times the sum to the next beggar that applied. But all this whole apparatus of folly, if it ever prevailed practically to any considerable extent, has long gone down into utter desuetude and oblivion. And no wonder! In former ages, the Jew was pretty well relieved from all necessity for practising the arts of torment upon himself. His Christian brethren kindly took the work of expiation into their own hands. And, as for the modern children of Abraham,—it is not easy to imagine a class of men much less troubled by those vehement movements of the conscience, which drive the fanatic into a course of spontaneous severities. The tables of the money-changers are not the places in which the spirit of austere religionism is likely to be rampant. The Israelite of the present day, may, indeed, be grievously incumbered with the traditions of his forefathers. But the whole silly and impracticable scheme of their penitential discipline is, to him, just what it deserves to be, a mere lifeless letter—an empty mockery—a fiction introduced to give a sort of formal and theoretical perfection to his system of theology.

We have hitherto seen the pernicious operation of the religious emotions, when they have acquired an acrid quality; and when, by an introverted action, they corrode the heart, and disturb the moral temperament of the individual himself. But, frequently, their morbid activity is such that they not only rend the patient, but make him intolerably mischievous to every one within his reach. And this is the class of cases which the author designates as the Fanaticism of the Brand. We all know the keen resentment which is frequently aroused by conflicts of opinion. People are perpetually quarrelling, and lashing themselves up into mutual aversion, because they cannot coincide in their view of questions supremely unimportant to themselves, or any other human being. If the matter in dispute should be of any considerable moment, the discussion becomes hotter. And hence

the bitterness with which social intercourse is frequently infested by political controversy. Now of all matters that can fall under discussion, there is none which agitates the spirit of man so deeply as religion. Men may, sometimes, be found who will violate the whole spirit of their religion, in their tempers, their actions, and their habits. But yet they will persecute for it, and possibly die for it. No partizanship is so fierce, as partizanship for a system of faith. The matters which religion involves are so vast in their magnitude and their consequences,—the whole affair is of such overwhelming and solemn importance—that when it gives birth to irritation and excitement, there is no bound to the conflagration which may follow. And then, further, the subject is one which is constantly found to invest with its own proper solemnity and sacredness, every thing which may be, however accidentally, attached to it. Not only the essence of the thing itself, but its mere equipments and appendages, appear to the eye of the faithful to be enveloped in the same mysterious and consecrated mantle. And hence it is that all merely “secular contentions seem vapid and trivial,” when compared to that conflict between mind and mind which is kindled by unearthly interests. “Common hatred now rises into immortal abhorrence. Wrath swells to execration; and every ill wish breaks out in anathemas.”

All this is unquestionable; and, when followed out into its consequences, goes nigh, we think, to the solution of most of the cases of the persecuting fanaticism. But this is not enough to satisfy the author. The insanity has sometimes been at once so absurd and so outrageous, that he is tempted to look still further beneath the surface, in order to find other agencies which contribute to the production of such horrible results. He apprehends that there is something yet deeper than we have yet examined, “in the tendency to employ torments and death as means of persuasion.” And in order completely to account for such astounding infatuation, he supposes the rancorous passion to be guilty of something like a paralogism, and to run after its victim in a sort of vicious circle. For instance,—the furious zealot is intent upon the destruction of a heretic. But the heretic happens to be a person of unimpeachable worth and innocence; blameless in every respect, save that of an inflexible dissent from the opinions of the persecutor. At first sight, then, it seems quite abominable to let loose the furies of pious vengeance upon the head of a righteous and exemplary man. There is something within which powerfully remonstrates against the iniquity of the deed. How, then, is this internal resistance to be suppressed? By what contrivance is innocence to be invested with the darkest attributes of guilt, and thus marked out as a fit sacrifice to the

Moloch of orthodoxy? Why truly, there are the forms of judicial proceeding—the awful solemnities of justice. The man is, beyond all question, chargeable with error—with very dangerous error. It is, therefore, at least fit that he should be consigned to custody by the guardians of the faith. And when he is there, what but the dungeon must be his portion? And with whom will he thenceforth be connected, in the imagination of all, but with criminals and misbelievers? And while he is thus herded with that class of miscreants, there will gradually gather about him a savour of ignominy. The freshness of his fair fame will undergo a blight. He entered his cell in the firmness and majesty of conscious rectitude. He comes forth from it, pale with the paleness of a withering captivity, and perhaps worn down with sickness of heart, and shaken to pieces with horrible imaginings. He is now, therefore, openly numbered with the transgressors. And when this is so, his enemy will be comforted with the thought that he has a fair and reasonable licence to hate him. But this is not the whole. The rack may probably be employed, purely in mercy to the soul of the misguided man. And this puts him beyond the pale of human sympathy at once. His shrieks and groans are his accusers. They are the accents which are often heard to issue from the lips of hardened guilt. Here, then, there is an end of all misgiving or remorse. Why should there be compassion for one on whom the laws of God and man are at work? “The circle of our ideas is now complete. Our moral instincts come round to their close. We breathe again: and by inflicting those heavy injuries, *which are presumptive evidence of demerit*, we prove to ourselves, as well as to the world, that the object of our hatred was, indeed, worthy of detestation.”

Now we must honestly confess that we do not quite know what to say to all this. It is a somewhat dark and tortuous exposition of the matter. We all know, indeed, how natural it is for men to hate those whom they have injured. But it is rather a startling refinement in malignity, to injure a man for the express purpose of having a good reason for hating him! It must be allowed, however, that there is one familiar instance in which an enemy was pursued to destruction by a sort of circuitous contrivance, somewhat similar to that which is here ascribed by the author to fanatical malevolence. Every one has probably heard of the man who said to a dog that displeased him, “I will not beat thee, but I will give thee a bad name;” and immediately set up the cry of, *mad dog!* And, in this case, no one, we suppose, would have been much surprised to see the *scrupulous* persecutor subsequently joining the hue and cry, and in at the death of the ill-fated quadruped. It is, further, very possible that during the rabid fanaticism of the French Revolution, there were some

among the numbers *suspected of being suspicious persons*, who may have been victims of this sort of moral logic! And if so, no man can say that the same resolute distortion of humanity and common sense may not have sacrificed its thousands, or its tens of thousands, during the bloodiest centuries in the annals of Christendom. Nevertheless, we, somehow or other, have our doubts about the theory. We, really, are not quite deep enough in the matter to affirm it, or to contradict it. We must, therefore, content ourselves with recommending it to the investigation of the sagacious analysts of human nature.

It is quite impossible for us to follow the writer throughout the process of anatomical *demonstration* exhibited in this section. He shows himself a bold and skilful, but certainly not an unfeeling operator. No department of the morbid anatomy of the subject escapes him. But his knife is under the guidance of a firm hand and a steady eye: and his voice is frequently heard to mitigate the disgust and horror excited by the spectacle, and to bespeak our compassion for the unhappy men who were transformed by the hideous disease which possessed them, into the tormenters and executioners of the human race. His representation of the Papacy, though perhaps a little exaggerated in its drawing, and somewhat fierce in its colouring, is, on the whole, executed with great fidelity and power. The whole is a tremendous commentary on the well-known maxim, that no corruption is so pestilent as the corruption of what is best. In Scripture, the promise of grace, and the declaration of wrath, appear combined together, as it were, by a sort of chemical union. They coalesce into a compound whose properties are distinct from those which belong to either of the separate ingredients; and they form together the medicine which alone can purify and regenerate the world. But the Papal alchymy has effected a violent and pernicious decomposition of these two elements; in consequence of which, they have, in a great measure, lost the healing qualities possessed by them in combination. In the hands of the Romish physician the one often becomes a deadly narcotic; the other a virulent poison which brings on trembling, and horror, and prostration of heart. In the Papal system, justice and mercy have *not* embraced each other. They have each held an independent empire. The Romish doctrine, or at least the Romish practice, of remission, has well nigh dethroned the moral sense. The Romish doctrine of retribution has smitten down the spirit of man beneath the domination of the priesthood. And the result has been a despotism more cruel and more perfidious than the world has ever beheld. What is the Papal scheme of absolution, but a sanctuary open for vice and guilt; a mercenary retreat for all impurity and unholiness? And what—as this writer asks—what is the Papal purgatory, or the

Papal hell, but the state prison of the Papal tyranny? What are the inflictions of the infernal dungeon itself, but the exemplars of sacerdotal barbarity? What is the Romish place of perdition, but a place of punishment for the infidel, and the heretic, and whoever may provoke the jealousies of the church? And what impression does this sort of theology convey of the Divine character and government?

“ Under such an influence, we learn to think that the most heinous crimes,—crimes aggravated by a full knowledge of religion, and committed in the face of its sanctions,—enjoy perpetual impunity, by the means of a villainous and interested *misprision* on the part of the functionaries of heaven : so that, in fact, justice takes no hold of those, whose fortune it is to be born upon a canonical soil, and where, the dispensing power having its agents, pardons are always in the market. The actual state of morals in countries where, age after age, nothing has been tolerated that might serve to correct the proper influence of popery,—Spain, Portugal, Italy,—is proof enough that these suppositions are not imaginary.” “ True it is,” the author adds, “ that the ecclesiastical hell of the Romish despotism has, of late, been closed, and a seal set upon it by the strong hand of the civil power, or the stronger hand of popular opinion ; but the dogma is what it was, and where it was. The pent-up fire of its revenge still murmurs through the vaults of the spiritual edifice, from the mouth of the Tagus to the Carpathian mountains ; give it only wind, and how should it rage to the skies ! The Waldenses, the Lollards, the Reformed of Germany, Italy, Spain, Holland, England, and the Huguenots of France, were the victims, not of a cruel age, but of a cruel doctrine ; and that doctrine is as cruel now, as it was in the pontificate of Innocent III.”—*Fanaticism*, p. 176.

Of course, it is no difficult matter to see how the most hideous forms of fanatical rage should emerge out of a cauldron like this. Under a spiritual autocracy, spiritual rebellion was to be crushed without delay, and without remorse. And what was there to arrest the arm of vengeance? The obstinate rebel was already doomed to eternal flames. What then could it matter whether the work of wrath began a little later or a little earlier? What were the torments of the stake itself, but a slight foretaste of the flames which never might be quenched? And how weak was the compassion which would spare the heretic these few grains of misery, when the spectacle might possibly preserve a multitude of souls from eternal and hopeless suffering? Here, then, was a principle which, at once, threw the gates of hell wide open, and provided an easy entrance for all the furies which have ever sent the sword and the brand throughout Christendom ; and caused all other tyranny to “ pale its ineffectual fires” before the tyranny of Rome. Subsidiary to these horrors was the compulsive celibacy of religious orders, which has so often converted the human heart

into a laboratory of the hottest venom; and the institution of the confessional, which has made the ear of the church the *cloaca maxima* of the Christian world. We are unable to follow the author through his investigation of these atrocities. We cannot however forbear to present the reader with his picture of the Inquisition, and of the passions which preside there. It may possibly appear to some a little overwrought. But,—we say it in sorrow for abused and perverted humanity,—there can be little doubt as to the substantial truth of the representation.

“ Shall we pass from the light and air of an English court, to some pestilent cavern of the Holy Office?—an atmosphere in which Justice has never borne to remain even an hour, and in which Mercy never spoke.\* The reverend assessors, with their obsequious ministers—tools in hand, are, we will imagine, drawn in even proportions from the three classes just specified. To the right and left sit those of the first sort—the *lookers on*, whose vote for the use of the rack and pulley has often had a motive more detestable than even the most horrid malice, and who hasten the consent of the court to a fatal sentence that they may save the hour of some adulterous appointment. Next are those of our second class, in whose bosoms mingled passions, and alternate irreconcilable desires, are beating like the waves of a tempest-troubled sea. To them is not this very hour of gloomy service the season toward which tumultuous emotions have long been tending, as the time when they should get vent? It is then that the grinding torments of wounded pride or despair are to relax awhile; as if the culprit (Jew, or Moor, or heretic) who is to groan his hour upon the wheel, were to take up as substitute the anguish that grasps the heart of his judge. Nay, we do not carry imagination too far;—it belongs to human nature thus to feel;—the sight, and even the infliction of extreme suffering, loosens for a moment the gripe of internal distress. The vulture of remorse or revenge forgets his part to glare upon other agonies, and rests appeased in listening to another’s sighs.

“ But what say we of the President of the Court? to him we must

\* “ The author will be thought to have forgotten that the great Ximenes de Cisneros presided eleven years in the court of the Inquisition. Did then neither Justice nor Mercy accompany the cardinal in his descents to the vaults of the Holy Office? Yes, the Justice and the Mercy of the Romish Church went with him there. By what rule are we to think of men—that of their professions, or that of their deeds? During the inquisitor-generalship of Ximenes, fifty thousand Moors, under terror of death and torture, received the grace of baptism; while more than an equal number of the refractory were condemned. Of these, two thousand five hundred and thirty-six he burned alive. Or, supposing the whole number to have been evenly distributed through the period of his presidentship, it will appear that between Sunday and Sunday of every week of those years he committed (to reject the odd two hundred and forty-eight) four men or women to the flames! Let it be affirmed that, in the “ New Regulations,” some regard was paid to the rights of the accused; yet was the entire process a horrible snare, so contrived as to render the escape of the victim almost impossible. Besides, is not reason insulted by talking at all of the justice of the details of a judicial process, the object of which was to maintain an execrable usurpation? We may mourn indeed that a mind of fine quality should be found in company with a Torquemada; but we must not so outrage the great principles of virtue as, on account of talents or accomplishments, to screen one murderer of thousands, while we consign another to infamy.”



allow the praise of loftier motives. Not since sunset of yesterday has he tasted bread, or moistened his shrivelled bloodless lip. Watching and prayer, though they have not spent him, have wrought up the chronic fever of his pulse to a tremulous height, that almost reaches delirium. Yet settled and calm is his front, and his eye glazed :—the spirit, how is it abstracted from mortal connexions ! human sympathies are as remote from his soul as are the warmth, the fruits, and the pleasures of a sultry Syrian glen, from the glaciers and snow that encrust the summits of Lebanon. The communion of the soul is with the things of another world.—Alas ! not the world of love and joy, but the gulf of misery ! In every sense, immediate and figurative, this terrible personage is son and minister of hell. And now he comes from his cell to his chair that he may again realize, in a palpable, visible, and audible form, those conceptions of pain, horror, revenge, perdition, upon which the monotonous meditations of his cloister are employed. The dark ideas that haunt his imagination, night and day, stoop the wing to this hour, in which the implements of anguish are to bring forth shrieks and groans, such as shall give new vividness to the fading impression of misery which he delights to revolve.

“ Idle, ah how idle is the hope entertained by the cold and shuddering culprit, when, as brought up from his dungeon, he rapidly peruses each reverend visage in expectation of descrying on one, or upon another, the traces of reason and mercy !—Alas, it is for this very purpose, and no other, it is to sigh, to shrink, to writhe, to shriek, that he has been dragged to the dim chamber of the Holy Office :—he stands where he stands, because the men who sit to mock him with forms of law, have need (each in a special manner) of the spectacle of his misery.

“ Does the history of popish tyranny bear out, or does it refute our descriptions ?—let them stand or be condemned by an appeal to records that are open to every eye.”—p. 202—205.

It is some relief to pass from the Fanaticism of the Brand, to the Fanaticism of the Banner : from the pestilential damp, and deadly gloom of the inquisitor's den,—(over whose portal is written, *Lasciate ogni speranza, voi ch' entrate*,)—to the “ broad field and open sky.” If we are to perish, cries Ajax, let us at least perish in the light of day. If persecution must come, let it come arrayed in the pomp and circumstance of war, rather than in the cowl, and the scapulary, and the frock. Let it come with its slaughter weapon unsheathed, rather than with its infernal apparatus of secret torture. Let it come, with noble daring and generous emotion in its train, rather than with the cowardly and viperous passions engendered in the cold and *dark and cruel places* of superstition. “ In escaping from the Consistory to the Camp, we seem to breathe again.” The fanatical soldier may, perhaps, have been the minister of as wide a desolation as the fanatical priest. But better is it to fall in a glorious struggle for our hearths and altars, than to be dragged down into subterraneous



shambles; and to render up our spirit in groans, which fall upon hearts like the granite of the walls around them. Nay, more—even a military massacre, is a less hideous thing, than a wholesale *auto-da-fè*.

The author's section on this subject is extremely interesting. The comparison between the spirit of Mohammed, and the spirit of the Crusaders, strikes us as very justly conceived, and powerfully executed. The picture of Bernard, that most wonderful of Monks,—(whose trumpet maddened the whole of Europe, but sent forth, alas! a most *uncertain sound*, when it spoke in the tone of prophecy)—is wrought up with great felicity and force. And lastly, there is something very animated, and very instructive, in his review of the progress of the national mind among the Jewish nations; beginning from the period of the captivity, and ending with the destruction of the Holy City. It is very remarkable that Idolatry should have been unlearned at Babylon, the very Pandemonium of fictitious deities. When this vile slough of superstition was cast off, one might have imagined that the chosen people would, as it was, have *renewed their youth*, and have been almost like men *created anew unto righteousness and true holiness*. Then, if ever, it might be hoped, that the world would indeed have looked upon a consecrated race, a whole nation of priests, a people devoted to the service of the One Living God, and distinguished by manifest indications of his favour. But it was not so.—The doctrines of immortality, indeed, then began (if we may so speak) to transpire more sensibly than they had ever done before, and to give a new character to the national feeling and theology. Under the Maccabees we find exemplified, for the first time, the spirit, not merely of ardent nationality, but of religious martyrdom. The hope of “a better resurrection,” then began to animate the heroes and the matrons of Israel. But together with this feeling, there seems to have grown up, from generation to generation, a deepening impatience of foreign domination. The yoke they had to endure was successively imposed by the heathen and the idolater: and, to them, the abominations of idolatry were now become intolerable. And thus it was that a spirit of fanatical inveteracy was, for three centuries, constantly gathering in the public mind: and “after many a portentous heave, it at length burst forth, and spread an universal ruin.”

The working of this temper was rendered more fierce and more intense by various causes;—the prevalence of sectarian and factional violence—the confident expectation of the Messiah—the hope of national deliverance—the prospect of an Empire of which Jerusalem was to be the metropolis. We all know the prodigies of desperation which emerged out of this boiling chaos of feel-

ings. The obstinacy and fury which signalled the downfall of the chosen race, might furnish a precedent for every fanatical excess of hatred, to all succeeding times. The world has, in that history, an apocalypse of the horrors which gather round a people utterly abandoned by the Lord, and given up to the frenzy which rushes into the soul, when once the powers of heaven have departed from it.

From the inflammatory stages of the disorder, the writer proceeds to its more tame and moderate form, when it assumes the type of a chronic malady; frequently attended, however, with symptoms of formidable exasperation. The Fanaticism of the Symbol, is no other than the *odium theologicum*, when it vents itself in an eruption of bitter words,—in abuse, and denunciation, and anathema. Of all the varieties of this peculiar character, Jerome is selected as the great exemplar,—almost the prototype. In his retreat at Bethlehem, that very learned, very acute, but extremely irritable and arbitrary personage, lay crouching for the greater part of his life, as in a sort of theological *panopticon*. From this position, his eye seemed to command every region, and every department, of the great ecclesiastical enclosure. The slightest symptom of disorder or mutiny, in the remotest quarter, could not escape his vigilance. He was always ready in an instant to spring forth, and to lift up his voice, and, if need were, to order the refractory prisoner to be double-ironed. He might even be compared to a grim and keen-set spider, throned in the centre of his complex and viscid net-work, and conscious of the smallest movement in any one filament of the subtle fabric. In his discussion of this portion of his subject, the author puts forth, as usual, a good deal of powerful writing; and propounds many ingenious, and spirited, and some original sayings: more than we have space to examine, or to present to the reader. We must, therefore, confine ourselves to the remark, that, throughout this whole section, we have been haunted with a feeling of confusion and perplexity. We cannot be sure that we have ascertained the practical drift and tendency of the writer's speculations. He seems deeply persuaded, for instance, that in some shape or other, the demon of fanaticism will never cease to infest the Church; and that it would, therefore, be extremely desirable that the Church should at all times be furnished with an apparatus for drawing off this spirit of restless ambition. He, accordingly, asks, "whether some permanent, and readily available provision should not be made, within the arms of a Protestant Church, for giving a range to those extraordinary dispositions and talents, which in all times make their appearance, and which, if not pre-occupied, do not fail grievously to trouble the community that

neglects them?" (p. 329.) All this is easily said. But it would have been much more satisfactory if he had furnished us with some plain suggestions, for the construction and application of the *safety valve*. The Church of Rome was a great mistress of this sort of mechanism. She understood, to perfection, the art of letting off the superfluity of expansive element; and of relieving the internal pressure, which else might have rent and scattered the whole structure into fragments. But how is her skill to be imitated by any Church formed on Protestant principles? The Romish craft, by which her own security was provided for, was throughout unscriptural: and we are not well able to imagine how any thing like it could be extensively adopted by us, without a sacrifice of genuine Christian simplicity. Again,—there is evidently floating in the author's brain some indefinite alarm at the evils of the intolerant temper. And this apprehension betrays itself in the shape of dark surmises, and ambiguous sayings. He seems to be afraid to speak out. Whether it be that he feels the difficulty of drawing, firmly and broadly, the line which is to separate between things that are subordinate, and things that must be contended for even unto blood,—or whether it be that he is under apprehensions lest more harm than good may be done by uttering a voice of arraignment which might startle any one among the numerous divisions into which the Christian world is rent,—what it is we know not; but, somehow or other, his admonitions and his cautions are so vague and indistinct, that it is scarcely possible to make any good practical use of them. Of one thing he seems quite convinced; namely, that English theology is, at this day, sectarian and factious. And he leaves all sects and factions—including, we suppose, the Church of England—to make the best of this salutary rebuke. He is, further, satisfied that there is something in the present aspect and practice of professed Christianity, which fatally impedes its progress through the world. But it would be almost vain to seek in his pages for any precise exposition of his views as to what is to be *done*, in order to remedy the defect. In short, we rise from his lucubrations with a sort of obscure apprehension that we must all be wrong,—but without any very clear conception as to what we are to aim at, in order that we may all be right! We must, however, do him the justice to say that there is one sentiment, which appears to brood over all his meditations, and which—if any thing could—might act like a polar star, to all our thoughts, and to all our designs; and that sentiment is, that "the Gospel is at once the expression and the means of the DIVINE BENEVOLENCE TOWARD MANKIND AT LARGE." On this ground we can meet him with entire cordiality and confidence. To all

who entertain this view of the Divine counsels, we can say, with warmth and integrity of heart, *Peace be upon them, and upon the Israel of God.* The sentiment, we know, is liable to abuse. But so is all other truth. This, nevertheless, is a *symbol*, in behalf of which we could be well content to be deemed *enthusiasts*. But it is a creed which is the death of all *Fanaticism*.

Man is fallen, and depraved, and sold under sin. Therefore he must be redeemed. Thus speaks the Bible. Man is spiritually abominable. Therefore he is to be scorned and hated. Thus says the spirit of religious misanthropy. And whence is this discrepancy between the oracles of mercy, and the fulminations of human passion? That there is nothing like fanaticism in the Scriptures of truth, the author has undertaken to show in his two concluding sections; which form, in our judgment, the most delightful and instructive portion of his work. The Old Testament breathes nothing of *national* fanaticism. The Jews indeed were separated from all other people under heaven. But what do the chosen tribes perpetually hear from the very man who was appointed to effect this separation? Are they told by him only of the grandeur of their own destiny, and of the vileness of all the human race besides? It would seem, on the contrary, as if his main object had been to break down their spirits by incessant rebuke, and by dire vaticinations of the ruin which their disobedience would pull down upon their heads. In after times, an heroic adventurer is advanced to be captain over the Lord's heritage. And if ever the voice of patriotic flattery were to be heard, surely it would be from the lips of *the man whom the people loved*,—the Warrior, the King, the Bard. But no,—the anthems of the Psalmist of Israel breathe of sadness, and contrition, and frequently of reproof: and if ever they swell into celestial rapture, it is,—not when the earthly glories of Israel are before him,—but when the righteousness and the mercy of Jehovah are his theme. Then followed a long succession of holy and inspired men: and, when they took up the burden of the Lord, it was evermore a chief part of their office, to put a bridle in the jaws, and a hook in the nostrils, of rancorous nationality, and arrogant religionism. Lamentation and mourning,—woe and wrath—run throughout their ministrations in every variety of sorrowful and tremendous cadence. But, further, can the prophets themselves be pointed out as examples of *personal* religious virulence? The office of denouncing public vengeance, year after year, is, humanly speaking, most dangerous to all kindly and charitable feeling. Its tendency is to make the zealous man a gloomy fanatic. Were the prophets then fanatics? Mark well the accents of tenderness and affection which are perpetually heard amid the deepest

pealings of their thunder. Mark their incessant recurrence to topics of encouragement and hope. One instance, indeed there was, in which a prophet thought that *he did well to be angry*, because the arm of vengeance was staid. But this instance is mentioned only to be condemned. It is recorded for a testimony, that *the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God*. Is fanaticism, then, to be learned from the New Testament? Nay, rather, is the evil spirit rebuked and put to silence by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of Jesus and his Apostles. It is true that,

“ compared with Moses, or with the Prophets, or with other religious institutors, Christ might, in a sense, be called the Herald of Wrath. Not one of his ministers, so far as appears, came up to their Master in the fulness or the frequency of his announcement of the doom of the impenitent. They, though with firmness, yet with modesty and fear, assert the terrors of Divine Justice ; but He speaks like one whose eye, piercing the thin veil of the material world, continually gazed upon the mysteries of the unseen. The Apostles spoke with the confidence of faith ; Christ with the vivacity of immediate knowledge. And yet, who, like Jesus, has manifested the glory of the Father, whose glory is love ? ” “ With that serenity, which befits the Author of Christianity, — as Author of all things, and Sovereign of the Universe, — he puts in play each proper impulse of the Moral Economy. Purblind Philosophy may call them incompatible. Nature and Truth shall pronounce them one.” — (pp. 446, 448.) “ He whose purity was the purity of God, and whose compassion was the compassion of God, is heard to utter, in one and the same breath, the language of inflexible justice, and of absolute love. Holiness and benevolence then are one : and we should be content to confide implicitly in such a proof that they are so.” — (pp. 452, 453.)

Here, then, must be an *end* of all fanaticism. The only wonder is that, with the Gospel of Jesus open before them, men could ever have admitted their religion to discourse with their malignant and rancorous passions. We would gladly conduct the reader through the remainder of the argument, in its application to the first Disciples of Christ, as their spirit is exhibited in the Apostolic writings. But we must forbear. No justice can be done by an abridgment to the writer's enlightened and consolatory meditations. They, however, who will consult them, can hardly fail to rise from the employment wiser and better and happier men.

---

- ART. II.—1. *Sermons and Sketches of Sermons, by the late Rev. Henry Gipps, LL.B. Vicar of St. Peter's and Rector of the united Parish of St. Owen, in the City of Hereford; revised, with some introductory Remarks upon his Pulpit Ministry.* By the Rev. J. A. Latrobe, M.A. sometime Curate of the said parishes, and Chaplain to the Right Hon. Lord Mountsandford. London. Seeley. 1833. 8vo. pp. 468.
2. *Remarks on Party Distinctions in Religion; addressed to the Orthodox and Evangelical Clergy of the Church of England.* By the Rev. J. B. James, B.C.L., M.D., F.L.S., of Queen's College, Cambridge, and Curate of Hanwell, Middlesex. London. Rivingtons. 1833. 8vo. pp. 63.

WE had resolved not to touch upon the *internal* state of the Church, (although we do mean, at no distant period, to speak at large upon it, and to speak very plainly,) until the external foes, by whom it is beleaguered, had been driven from its walls. Who is there, however, who must not feel it to be a strange and portentous thing, that the evils, which afflicted Jerusalem just before it was vanquished and demolished by the Romans, should present almost an exact emblem of our own spiritual Sion? and that they who should defend the city, as with a single heart and a single arm, are turning their weapons one against another, and weakening themselves by their intestine divisions, even while the battering rams of a foe, flushed with unexpected successes, are thundering at the gates? Still, although we are most sensible of the scandal and the danger of this position of things, many obvious considerations, and, foremost among them, an eager desire rather to heal divisions than to exasperate animosities, would at the present moment have induced us to keep silence. But it was not to be. The posthumous work of Mr. Gipps, published under the editorship of Mr. Latrobe, together with several other indications to which we cannot remain blind, absolutely force us to say a few words—words wrung from us with an extreme reluctance, and uttered far more in sorrow than in anger.

The production of Mr. Gipps, "*the profits*" of which, we perceive, are "*to be given to the Church Missionary Society,*" consists of sermons of the evangelical school, composed in a plain and homely, but sometimes energetic style, and, with an earnest sincerity, sometimes harshness, of tone. If we had room, we might object, in some places, to the tenor of the theology as being a partial and exclusive exhibition of Christian doctrine:—but our business is rather with the language which Mr. Gipps thought fit to adopt with respect to other ministers, and probably



the majority of ministers in the bosom of the same church. How, we ask, could the late Mr. Gipps allow himself to write and preach—and how could Mr. Latrobe allow himself to print and publish, such expressions as “*false ministers*,” and “*ungodly ministers*,” applied to the clergy of the establishment? What, again, can be meant by such passages as the following?

“Those who set before their flocks any other way of salvation—who tell men, that God is not so strict as the Bible represents—that they will be saved, if they only do their best, come to church, and the sacrament, and live decent, moral lives, are not *the ministers of Christ*.”—p. 197.

“But, alas, how are the mysteries of God withheld by too many *blind leaders of the blind*, who call themselves *ministers*. The fall of man, and especially the effect of that fall, in the blindness and corruption of man’s heart, are kept out of view. The agency of evil spirits is scarcely mentioned by them, because not felt or believed by themselves. The work of the Holy Spirit on the heart is confounded with the baptism of the flesh; and thus the mystery is made no mystery, and the effect reduced to nothing; as may be seen in the lives of most baptized persons. The real work of the Holy Spirit in the experience of believers, is held forth as fanaticism by those ministers who are themselves strangers to it. So also even with respect to the great mystery of redemption. Christ is proposed by such ministers, rather as a teacher of morality, than as our great High Priest, or as the Lamb of God slain for us, or as the Lord our righteousness. The great mystery of the death of God upon the cross for lost sinners is seldom spoken of, whilst Christ is scarcely held forth, except as having come down to teach mankind a higher and better system of morals. In these various ways, the great mysteries of God are kept out of sight by those that call themselves his stewards. Doubtless this is far more agreeable to their own hearts, and far more soothing and pleasant to the carnal and wordly hearts of the hearers; but it is utterly contrary to the character of *ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God*.”—p. 203, 204.

Perhaps some explanation may be found in Mr. Latrobe’s account of his late friend, in the introduction which he has prefixed to the discourses. The insinuations, at least, are of a piece with the foregoing extracts.

“The breathings of his spirit after his Lord, and after the souls of men, could not let him rest, if the golden moments, devoted to the ingathering of Christ’s flock, were frittered away by opinions or statements, which might please the imagination, but *contained not the marrow of gospel-truth*. Hence he had a most tender sense of the importance of improving the present opportunity, and was never content, for personal convenience, knowingly to leave his church, *for a single time*, in the hands of one, who should not preach Christ *fully*—under the deceitful idea, that no great mischief would accrue from one or two *unsound* discourses, so that the people were fed with becoming meat the rest of the



year. His love to Christ was too ardent to permit him thus to *trifle with his cause*, and his concern for sinners too deep to induce him to expose them for a moment, through his negligence, to *such food as was poisonous or diseased*."—p. xxviii.

If this publication were an insulated thing we should have attached scarcely any importance to its contents; nor should we have contributed by a single remark to stop its course to the oblivion, which probably awaits it. But we have oral as well as written evidence before us. Our own ears have been pained by statements delivered from the pulpit quite on a par with these quotations; and reports have reached us of language so flagrant in its actimony, that, instead of repeating, we are still unwilling to believe it to have been uttered.

At the same time the authorized and accredited organs of the party, to which, as we suppose, Mr. Gipps belonged, are most incautious and unguarded, to say the very least, in the terms which they habitually employ. In the files of the "*Record*" newspaper, for instance, there may be found stronger expressions of censure and dislike, with reference to the high church clergy and their publications, than with reference to any class or denomination of Dissenters, with the exception of the Unitarians. Thus in the criticisms of the tracts sent forth by the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge, such complimentary epithets as "abominable and destructive," are scattered about with a most lavish and unsparing profusion.

So far we have adduced only the sentiments of persons who are yet within the pale of the establishment, and who profess to be its staunchest and most serviceable friends.

Other parties, however, are rejoiced to take advantage of such sentiments, and use them for the purpose of propagating *their own*. The shafts of their malice, if not drawn from this very quiver, are barbed and pointed by the hands which hold it. The Utilitarians and Infidels of the country bring forward, as one main argument against the church connected with the state, the startling declaration of many among its ministers, that a vast proportion of their body do not fulfil their duties either as divines in what they preach, or as clergymen in what they practise. And the *Morning Chronicle* informs us, that "*the more serious part of the clergy are favourable to the voluntary principle*," in opposition to an established church.

Or let us look to another quarter in the political hemisphere. The Dissenters, as we have shown in our last number, derive a triumph from the fact, that it is customary for some of the Church-clergy themselves to speak of large tracts of the country in which there is only here and there a solitary clergyman who

“preaches the Gospel.” We have also shown that the Dissenters offer their pulpits, with a cordial invitation, to the “*Evangelical Episcopalians* :” although the Evangelical Episcopalians, such as Mr. Gipps, will not admit their brethren in the church to the pulpits which they occupy, from a dread of “*unsound discourses*,” and food “*that is poisonous and diseased*.” It is, in fact, the great manœuvre of the Dissenters to separate more and more the two parties in the establishment; to pursue the one with malignant and vehement invectives; and to entice the other over to themselves. But this strategy would be hopeless, if there were no weak or treacherous adherents in the camp.

These are the simple facts. We have brought testimony from the most opposite sources, all tending to the one point, that it is the practice—that it is the system—with certain ministers of the established church, to describe that establishment, in the actual constitution of its parts, as almost a mass of rottenness and corruption; and the larger portion of its officiating members as “hirelings” and not “true shepherds,” loose in morals and conversation—ignorant or careless of the word of God.

Who can wonder at the consequences? Who can wonder that an outcry has been raised about the inefficiency of the church; or that lamentations have been so frequent about the disputes and discord in the church? Who can wonder that even Christian societies are pestered with the prate of its having gone through the length and breadth of the land, that the Church of England does not teach the Gospel of Christ in the fulness of its purity and power.\* “Gone through the length and breadth of the land!” The question is, who *sent* it through the length and breadth of the land? Of Mr. Latrobe and his friends we might demand the answer. Alas! publications, such as the present, inform us but too well whose breath has wafted the intelligence, and by whose efforts the obloquy has been spread. But are such men to reap the fruits of their own wrong? Are they first to propagate the report, and then to build ulterior steps upon the ground of its existence?

If the facts have been mis-stated, they will admit of easy refutation: if they are true, two words of comment may be fairly allowed us.

We are not the indiscriminate champions of the apostolical or high church party: and God forbid that we should be the indis-

\* In this article we have cautiously abstained from entering upon contested doctrines further than was absolutely required. Yet it is only just to say, that the charge which some ministers make against others of not teaching the Gospel, or not preaching the Gospel, would be more literally exact and more in conformity with the intentions of the accusers, if it ran, that they did not *exclusively* preach from St. Paul's *Epistles*, and, in particular, from the *Epistle to the Romans*.

criminate adversaries of the evangelical or low church party. There are men—oh ! many men in that party—who might adorn and help to consecrate any body of Christians upon the face of the earth—men whom all might be proud to imitate in the fervour of their exhortations and the purity of their lives. We hope and trust that it is a comparatively small number of fanatics who have made the mischief. But we know, also, that the same cuckoo cry, by whomsoever it is repeated—if only it *be* repeated without being put down—will tell fatally, and be believed at last. We are not so wild as to suppose that no variances of opinion will spring up upon minuter points of doctrine which the articles have left open : nor should we regard it as the sign of a sound and healthy state in the church, if all controversy should die away. There may be some few matters even on which we believe the more evangelical opinion to be the more orthodox :—and many, in which we are convinced that the difference is only verbal, and consists in the mere manner of expression :—and others again, in which, after our best endeavours to unravel it, we find it after all to be utterly unintelligible.

Still further, as to the discipline of the church and the practice of individuals, we may allow that what has been called “ the revival of religion in our land,” or the rise and progress of the evangelical section of our church, has been attended with some advantage. That the rubs and jars of opposition and the collision of near and formidable rivals, may have struck out the more glowing fires of a zeal which, in some particular cases, had been smouldering or almost stifled : that the apostolical or orthodox party, like *all* dominant parties, in the full unquestioned possession of power, had been too much wrapt up in that proud security, which is the parent of indolence, which is the parent of disaster ; that some few, we will not say abuses, but carelessnesses, had crept in here and there among the clergy ; and that individuals might be discovered who neither preached, nor acted, up to the terms and requisitions of the Bible ;—all these things are abundantly possible, because men are men, and human nature is erring and imperfect. Neither shall we deny that, in some particular cases, provocation may have been given to evangelical ministers ; and either a cold and haughty disdain, or a sarcastic ridicule, employed against men who made superior pretensions to vitality and spirituality of religion. But still we affirm that the truth of these charges, whenever they are true, has a reference far more to past times than to present : and we affirm likewise—nay we have proved—that the apostolical party is now the object of attack, and that, whatever measures it may adopt, they will be measures *strictly defensive*. Nor can one or all of the admissions which we

have made, afford the slightest justification for the arrows of contumelious abuse, directed from any point within the establishment itself. If an unfriendly assault is to be commenced upon the Church of England, we may surely say to Mr. Gipps, or Mr. Latrobe, or any individual of their school, "*non tu qui faceres tamen.*"

For ourselves, we hate party distinctions in religion quite as much as Mr. James can hate them, and it grieves us to the heart to use, as *terms* of distinction, words such as "evangelical" and orthodox," which ought only to designate the same persons or things; but we could not otherwise express our meaning without the most tedious circumlocution. We could say with Mr. James, "it is only an uncharitable spirit that will seek to desecrate Christianity by uncovering the failings and exposing the blemishes of her ministers:" we could say with him, "let us send forth the dove from the ark, and silently indulge the hope that she may return with the olive leaf in her mouth;" and there is an echo in the very depth of our souls to his concluding paragraph.

"I have only, in conclusion, to pray God that all animosity and party feeling may subside between us; that the ORTHODOX and EVANGELICAL CLERGY may not only *read, mark, learn, but live together in unity like brethren*; that, imitating each other's virtues and covering each other's defects, they may recollect, whatever constitutes their particular code of Christianity, that it is a *good Life* alone which must speak for them at the day of judgment; and that, stretching forth the hand of mutual friendship and forgiveness, they may henceforth be known by one and the same honourable appellation—faithful Ministers of the flock of Christ, and conscientious Clergymen of the Established Church of England."\*—p. 59.

Still the evil exists, and must be *met*. There are several

\* Mr. James's pamphlet is a well meant effort, written in a diffident and candid spirit. With a great deal we most cordially agree;—but why, to a very small pamphlet, should there have been a long table of contents, and an appendix at the end, with a "list of the quotations in this pamphlet, taken from the Scriptures and from other writings?" Why is a pleasing little production spoilt by an affectation so preposterously childish? Was there no good-natured friend at the elbow of Mr. James to dissuade him from such nonsense? A list of quotations, with a reference to the paragraphs in which they occur;—and quotations such as the following, and put just as we shall now put them, the italics included! "*Fallen on evil days and evil tongues,*" (*Milton.*) "*Suaviter in modo, &c.*" "Quotations from Johnson's Dictionary." "*Simplex Munditiis.*" "The modesty of nature." "*Video meliora, &c.*" "*Sunt certi denique fines, &c.*" "Allured to brighter worlds, &c." (*Goldsmith.*) "Signs of the times." The quotations from the Bible, given like the rest, once in the text and once in the appendix, with a reference, we purposely omit.

We have sometime wished that there could be drawn up, by authority, a catalogue of stale quotations and similes, which it should be an indictable offence any longer to use. We fear that the citations of Mr. James would be found at the very top of the list, and that he would have to pay penalty after penalty. And, perhaps, these quotations are, after all, so useful to us, poor wretches of periodical authors, that we should be most unwilling to part with them.

reasons which assure us that it is no longer expedient, or even morally right, to think of smothering dissensions by feigning ignorance of their existence ; or to pass without notice accusations which, from the very frequency of their recurrence, will be supposed to be founded upon justice, unless they are firmly and positively denied.

There are many imputations upon private character, under which it is shameful to rest : and, in the same way, there are many public charges which it is a kind of criminality even to suffer ; because forbearance may be mistaken for acquiescence. Yes ! under some charges, to sit silent is an *error*, and almost a *crime* ; and of such a nature is the charge of *not preaching the Gospel*," when applied to the ministers of the Gospel. Clergymen who can submit to it, dishonour their creed and destroy their own usefulness. Neither Christian meekness nor Christian charity forbids them to repel such a stigma with a holy and determined resentment. All the feelings of piety, which, on other occasions, would lead them to tameness and patience, must here impress upon them the necessity of an uncompromising resistance, a serious and almost stern expostulation.

Questions which involve the integrity and faithfulness of Christian ministers are far too momentous, far too solemn, to be evaded. They must be brought to an issue. Care, also, must be taken, lest we create the very evil which we are sedulous to avoid ; and by an anxiety to escape disputes, allow the elements of discord to obtain a strength which it will become utterly impossible to arrest or withstand. Alas ! in our attempts to preserve amity we may suffer the seeds of disunion to take such root that they will be irremovable. The rent may widen daily, and, in the end, run along from the top to the bottom of our establishment.

What, then, is to be done ? We call upon the excellent and moderate members of both parties, not to suppress or disguise their opinions, for that course never has answered, never can answer, never ought to answer, but *to declare their sentiments of truth and moderation*. Thus, we believe, it will at once appear, that an approximation to each other may be attained without the slightest sacrifice of principle on either side.\* At present we are too apt to judge of both parties by the virulence of their ex-

\* Whatever may be the value, as a theological collection, of the *Original Family Sermons* published by the Strand Committee of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, this good at least has been achieved, that, by looking through the names we find many influential members of both parties in the Church united together, and writing side by side without any wide or material difference perceivable in their doctrines.

tremes. Let the truly orthodox clergy abjure all who do not inculcate "the whole counsel of God," all who do not take a high standard both of doctrine and duty:—let the truly Evangelical clergy repudiate the extravagant enthusiasts by whom their cause is disgraced; and draw a line of marked separation between themselves and all persons whatsoever who can descend to coquetting with the Dissenters, and thus helping forward the dismemberment of the Church. Most especially, let them disdain all compliments paid at the expense of their brethren; and be assured, with the old philosopher, that nothing in this world carries with it so equivocal a sound, or so suspicious an appearance, as the praise of an enemy.

We oppose the Dissenters; but of *them* we do not complain. That seceders should endeavour to effect a schism in the Establishment is natural enough. They are labouring in their vocation. Their motives are transparent; their end and aim are quite intelligible. But it is hardly tolerable that other persons should join in the unhallowed crusade; and when we think again of the expressions—"false ministers," "ungodly ministers," "blind leaders of the blind, who call themselves ministers," "diseased or poisonous doctrine;" we cannot but ask, where is the Christian prudence, or the Christian charity, or the Christian truth, of such language? Is it honest? Is it even decent?

From such language, we repeat, and from the men who hold it, the worthier and more temperate members of the party called Evangelical must immediately and altogether disjoin themselves. Our assurance is, that they *will*. Against them, therefore, we throw out no taunts; we deal in no recriminations; we feel no bitterness; we would rather speak in the mildest terms of sorrowful remonstrance. It must be a severe aggression indeed upon the citadel of our Rome, which could tempt us to transfer the warfare to the shores of their Carthage. To them we would rather say, "there may have been faults on both sides; and on each side also there may have been too great an eagerness to expose the faults of the other to the world—to the watchful sectarian—to the scornful unbeliever. Happy will be the hour when, in all the essential principles of faith and practice, we can exhibit the glorious spectacle of "a city which is at unity in itself."

There will still, perhaps, remain a few insignificant men, who are thirsting for popular distinction, without being of that *calibre*, either in station, or influence, or talent, which can enable them to reach it by regular and honourable means. Their ambition, therefore, is to achieve a miserable notoriety by traducing the Establishment to which they belong. Abandoned to themselves,



and unsupported by the heads of their party, they will probably be harmless. This is the sheet-anchor of our hope; for, otherwise, we verily apprehend that they are persons upon whom all gentleness must be lost. They are insects troublesome while they buzz; but if they are likely to sting, it will be better that they should suffer mortification, than be allowed to inflict injury. Is it, alas, the fact, that they can only be deterred from their insane and mischievous career by a practical conviction that there is such a thing as a "rod for the fool's back?" Why will they not be satisfied, before some merited and indignant castigation sends them whimpering back to the obscurity which becomes them; and from which it is their worst folly to emerge? As men who neither seek their hostility nor fear it, we warn them, we entreat them, to pause; if neither warning nor entreaty will avail, they will have only themselves to thank for the consequences.

---

ART. III.—1. *Memoir of the late Right Reverend John Henry Hobart, D. D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the State of New York.* By the Rev. William Berrian, D. D. Rector of Trinity Church, New York. Swords and Co. New York. 1833.

2. *Journal of the Proceedings of the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, held in the City of New York, from October 17 to October 31, 1832.* New York. Protestant Episcopal Press. 1832.

THE subject of this memoir was one of those distinguished few, whose happiness it has been at once to merit and acquire a marked influence over the age and society in which they lived. The life of Bishop Hobart will form an era in the ecclesiastical history of his country; the ardent self-devotion of his character, the multiplied energies of a mind ready for every emergency, his promptitude of judgment and undeviating consistency of principle, his candour and simplicity of manners, the true index of a Christian singleness of heart, were qualities which admirably became a ruler in the Church of God, and which gained for him in congenial souls an ascendancy never to be effaced. The weight of his authority extended far over the scattered flock of Christians in America; it was seen during his life-time in the rapid and unprecedented extension of the church; and since his death it animates the pastoral clergy and episcopate of his country, by an example which is treasured in their most affectionate and dutiful remembrance.



The writings of Bishop Hobart have not been unappreciated in England. They bear the impress of his character, a fervent and vigorous eloquence, which, neglecting the graces of style, seizes on the essential merits of the question, and seldom fails to exhibit the truth in strong outline, distinctly marking its most important and genuine features. The effect thus produced is often more striking from the very absence of art in the composition; the thoughts flow from a well stored mind, and there can scarcely be any arguments more directly conclusive, than those which he has embodied in his "Apology for Apostolic Order," and his Pastoral Charges, in defence of the leading doctrines, the polity and orders of the Christian Church. But his writings are only a small portion of the services he rendered in his generation; he was born to act rather than to write; and it is a happiness to find that the history of a life so employed in the highest duties is now in a fair way of being more generally known, from the interesting and well-written memoir, with which a judicious friend and near connection of the deceased Bishop has here presented the Christian world.

The paternal ancestors of Bishop Hobart were originally from the county of Norfolk; and of the number of those who either from a spirit of enterprise or religious considerations, in the early part of the reign of Charles I. removed from their native country to Massachusetts Bay. That religious considerations had their influence in persuading the emigration is probable from the circumstance that Peter Hobart, a divine, educated at Cambridge, and Episcopally ordained, but strongly attached to the Presbyterian model, in 1635, followed his father and brothers to the new settlement. The whole family, which appears to have been numerous, together with some friends, agreed to form a new plantation, which they called, after their native village in Norfolk, by the name of Hingham. There Peter Hobart continued in the faithful discharge of his ministry for about forty-three years, and left several sons, who followed his professional labours in the colony, among whom was Dr. Nehemiah Hobart, who is recorded to have been "held in peculiar veneration as a scholar, a gentleman, and Christian."\* It is also said that the mother of the celebrated missionary, David Brainerd, was a daughter of the first pastor of Hingham.

By what means that branch of the family, from which Bishop Hobart came, was led to conformity with the Episcopal Church, we are not distinctly informed. He was lineally descended from Joshua Hobart, a younger brother of Peter, and fourth son of

\* He appears to have distinguished himself as a controversial writer against the Episcopal cause in the early part of the last century.

Edmund Hobart, the pilgrim father of the plantation. The next in descent had changed his abode from Massachusetts to Pennsylvania, previously to the origin of Penn's colony, and a marriage into a Swedish family there may have prepared the way to a change in his religious sentiments. It appears at least that from the earliest station of an episcopal minister at Philadelphia, the church-membership of the family was avowed. Here in 1775, John Henry Hobart was born, the youngest son of Captain Enoch Hobart and his wife, the daughter of ——— Pratt of Philadelphia. It is commonly said that there have been few eminently religious characters, whose bias cannot be traced to the influence of maternal piety. This was strikingly exemplified in Hobart. Left fatherless when only fourteen months old, the care of his childhood, with circumstances by no means affluent, devolved upon an admirable mother, who by rigid economy and self-denial, rendered still more pressing by the period of the revolutionary war, was enabled to provide for her family of five children, and to give to the youngest that liberal education of which she lived to see the first-fruits, long enough no doubt to bless Him who had thus guided her own discriminating affection, and inclined the heart of her son to the office of a Christian minister. She died while yet but a few years of that ministry were completed.

His school instructions were received from Dr. Andrews, a Churchman, and master of an Episcopalian school in Philadelphia, an excellent man and good scholar, whose dignity of character and conciliating manners had a powerful influence in shaping the future course of his pupil. Subsequently, at the age of fifteen, he was removed to the College at Princeton, New Jersey, a college founded by an English governor half a century before, and a principal place of education in the Central States. The president of this college was a Presbyterian, Dr. Witherspoon, whose name is known in this country from a treatise re-edited by the late Mr. Wilberforce; and its vice-president, Dr. Stanhope Smith, a name of some distinction in American literature, and who deserves honorable mention for the personal attachment he shewed, and the encouragement he gave to young Hobart, notwithstanding the difference of their views on Church Government, and on the Calvinistic points of doctrine. Many eminent persons were educated here as cotemporaries of Hobart, particularly the Hon. Richard Rush, lately the American minister in this country. The unanimity of their testimony to Hobart's superior talents and general worth fully justifies the detailed statement of Dr. Berrian. The following way of settling a doubtful competition would perhaps sound oddly if the scene had

been laid in an English University; but the incident is honourable to Hobart, and too characteristic to be omitted:

"Bishop Hobart was still residing in college, when I entered at Princeton, and was to me a subject of deep interest, from the animated contest in which he had been engaged for the first honour of the class. It was understood that the faculty had been a long time equally divided on the question; one half voted for Mr. Hobart, and the other for Mr. Bennett Taylor, a young man of great promise from Virginia. Neither party being willing to yield, it was ultimately agreed that Hobart and Taylor should be declared equal, and that chance should decide which of them should deliver the *Latin Salutatory*, the ordinary reward of the best scholar, and which the *English Salutatory*, usually regarded as the second distinction. Dr. Smith, who espoused Taylor's pretensions, threw up a quarter of a dollar, and Dr. Minto, who headed the other party, cried out 'Heads for Hobart!' There were some coarse rhymes in circulation, expressing the joy of the old gentleman, when he found that he had called aright."—*Berrian*, p. 47.

Shortly after this a temporary change took place in his prospects. The anxiety of his friends, who regretted that his talents should be given up to the *unprofitable* labours of a clergyman, prevailed with him to attempt to employ them in a counting-house. He submitted with that ready alacrity which never forsook him; but it was against the whole bias of his nature, and he soon afterwards accepted an offer, which was in a very honourable manner urged upon him by Dr. Smith, to become a tutor in the college at Princeton, with a view to pursue his studies for the ministry.

A temper so naturally disposed to the exercise of friendship, could not remain satisfied without finding some kindred spirit to receive the out-pourings of his heart. His friend was Abraham Skinner, one of his companions in study at Princeton, of whom however he was destined to be deprived by an early death. His correspondence with his friend is not unmarked by that boyish fondness, which in riper years excites a sigh or smile; but it exhibits very touchingly the leading principle of the man. The following extract is from a letter he wrote while engaged in the mercantile office we have just mentioned, at the age of eighteen:

"You will perhaps ask me whether I intend to continue in my present business. It pleases God, and O! how grateful should I be to Him for it, to continue to me impressions of the necessity of repentance, to give me daily convictions of the danger of living without being prepared, through the mercies of a Saviour, to leave it; and also to direct my view to another, in which my happiness or misery depends upon the use of my time and talents here. It is but too true, that these impressions are not cultivated as they ought to be, and on this account I ought to be the more grateful for their continuance; but I hope the time will soon ar-

rive, when they will be cultivated to better purpose. Though engaged in business, these things are continually rising to my thoughts, and I often think it is my duty to prepare for the ministry,—prepare for it, I say, for now I want every requisite. Far am I from thinking that I am qualified for it, either in mental or moral acquirements: but by the goodness of God I may attain those qualifications which would fit me for entering upon the study. Sacred, awful, and important would be my duties; the grace of God could alone enable me to execute them, O! pray with me, that in my entrance on this important office, I may have a single eye to His glory and the salvation of immortal souls; pray that He would subdue within me every desire of honour, of emolument, and praise, and that I may serve Him with sincerity and truth.”—*Berrian*, p. 50.

It is remarkable, in the midst of the perplexing circumstances into which he was thrown, how his attachment to Episcopacy was confirmed. He says himself, in allusion to these difficulties,

“My opinions on the subject of Episcopacy cannot be ranked among the prejudices of education. That part of my life in which my religious principles became a subject of my anxious investigation, was passed at a Presbyterian college. Respect and veneration for my instructors and guides in the paths of science,—esteem and affection for many valued friends, to whom I knew certain opinions on this subject would be obnoxious, excited in my bosom a painful struggle between the most amiable impulses of feeling and the strong demands of duty. But when after an honest and faithful examination I became satisfied that it was evident from Scripture and antiquity, that there have been from the Apostles’ times, three Orders of Ministers, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, in Christ’s Church, and that the Episcopal Church considered no man as a *lawful* Bishop, Priest, or Deacon, who hath not had Episcopal consecration or ordination, it surely became my duty to maintain what the Church thus solemnly declared. Perhaps I had also cause to apprehend that Episcopalians in many places were losing sight of these important truths.”—*Apology*, Letter V. p. 32.

There is a singular mark of his early judgment in the following passage, which seems to have been written after his return to Princeton:

“Dr. Smith, who is very attentive to me, seems to wish that I should begin to study his System of Divinity; but I am entirely opposed to studying any system whatever, till I understand more of the Sacred Volume, from which all their conclusions, if just, must be drawn. When the fountain is open, why have recourse to the streams which it supplies? Dr. White earnestly recommended me to *study the Bible, in order to form my opinions*.<sup>\*</sup> It seems too generally studied in order to support those which are preconceived; and perhaps this is the reason why so

\* It is pleasing to trace this catholic advice to the venerable Patriarch of the American Church, who is still, we believe, enjoying a green old age in the diocese of Pennsylvania, over which he has for nearly half a century presided. At the last General Convention of the Church, the resolution concluding the proceedings of the

many doctrines are maintained, which are inconsistent with it. When the study of the Bible is gone through, it may be advantageous to take up systems."—*Berrian*, p. 52.

A spirit of such fervent piety, directed by so sound a judgment, could not but afford the liveliest promise to the cause which it embraced. He continued to reside at Princeton, ably fulfilling the duties of a tutor and studying theology, for more than three years, when he returned to Philadelphia, and was ordained in June 1798, by Bishop White.

The situation of the American Church at this period was such as to invite none but the most devoted spirits to engage in her service. In all the provinces North of Maryland, there were scattered no more than *ninety* clergymen who had received Episcopal ordination, of whom twenty were in the State of New York, and seventeen in Pennsylvania.\* In the Southern States the depression was still more afflicting, from the contrast it presented to former prosperity. Striking is the picture drawn by Hobart himself several years later:†

"But little more than half a century has elapsed since our Church universally prevailed through the flourishing dominion of Virginia. In every county there were Churches and Chapels, all of them decent and substantial, some of them even splendid in their decorations. In those temples were statedly performed all the services of our primitive Liturgy. The parishes, not much short of one hundred, were all supplied with Clergy. What is the contrast? We have wept over it. Our hearts have been wrung with shame, with grief, that this contrast has been produced, not entirely (God forbid we should sink them under this tremendous guilt), but in no inconsiderable degree, by many of the Clergy themselves. What is the contrast? Few are the parishes in Virginia which enjoy the regular ministrations of a Clergyman. In many places the Liturgy is scarcely known, but as some antiquated book once used by their fathers. The edifices, where their fathers worshipped, now in a state of ruin, fix the astonished gaze, and excite the mournful sigh of the passing traveller; and in those courts where the living God was once invoked, and the messages of mercy through His Son proclaimed, no sounds are heard but the screams of the bird of night, or the lowings of the beasts of the field."

House of Bishops, strongly marks the affectionate reverence entertained for his character:

"Resolved, that the House of Bishops cherish the most devout sense of gratitude to Almighty God for His merciful Providence in having again allowed them to enjoy the presence and counsels of their venerated presiding Bishop; and hereby tender to their beloved Father in the Church their thanks for the repeated evidence now afforded of his kind, faithful, and important presidency over their deliberations, and assure him of their prayers for his continued health and happiness."—*Journal of the Convention*, pp. 96, 97.

\* Memorial of Bishop Hobart, p. xxxii.

† Bishop Hobart's Sermon at the Convention, 1814, p. 27.

The enquiry is naturally made, what could have provoked this extent of devastation? The connection of the Episcopal Church with the State Government in England, was no doubt the direct grievance; a Churchman and a foe to American liberty were held as synonymous terms. And in no part of the colonies did the revolt burst out with greater vehemence, than where there was the greatest fear of a loyal spirit to oppose it. But another offence is probably alluded to in the above passage, from which it is devoutly to be wished all Colonial Church policy should be kept pure. The cause of the Church, as we have lately endeavoured to show,\* was peculiarly favoured in the first planting of Virginia. The same spirit after the Restoration continued to direct its councils; but no plantation suffered equally from the hostility of the native Indians, their shipping was harassed by pirates, and their distress was accumulated by that remarkable civil war excited by Nathaniel Bacon at the close of the seventeenth century, a man who seems to have been prevented by an early death from becoming the Pizarro of British America. When quiet and prosperity were restored, both this province and Maryland having been divided into parishes, Churches were built, and an act of the Colonial Assembly fixed a salary on the minister of each parish. But it must be confessed that the act was often not carried into full effect. Sometimes for want of Clergy, the vestry appointed Lay-readers to do their office.† Sometimes the Clergymen, who came out, were such as sought only an honourable excuse for exile;‡ and perhaps the imposture of the infamous Dr. Wolcott was not a solitary example.§ The fatal defect was the want of Episcopal superintendence in the country.

The success of the Society for Propagating the Gospel on the continent of America, from its origin at the commencement of the last century, surrounded at all points by this vital difficulty, is very remarkable. At the time of its incorporation, the British colonists in America amounted to nearly half a million, of whom, with the exception of the provinces above-mentioned, scarcely any could be said to be within reach of the ministry of the Church: the newly settled stations, particularly the two Carolinas, were destitute of all religious ordinances. The Virginian clergymen,

\* No. XXVIII. Art. VII.

† In 1680 two-thirds were Lay Readers. Morgan Godwyn's *Negro's Advocate*, p. 170.

‡ "The only discipline I have yet exerted, has been to discard three out of my diocese, who, though refused certificates by me and my Clergy, have obtained good livings in America," &c.—*Correspondence of Dr. Clarke. Letter of Dr. Thomas Rundle (Bishop of Derry)*, 1740.

§ Gifford's Epistle to Peter Pindar. Other particulars may be found in Jonathan Boucher's *American Revolution*, p. 95, &c.; and in Bishop Hobart's *Appeal for Apostolic Order*, p. 244.



who sometimes visited them, found innumerable persons unacquainted with the Christian rite of baptism.\* In the provinces to the north of Maryland, a single church at Boston, one in New York,† and one in Philadelphia, were all the visible congregations which adhered to the English Liturgy. By the middle of the century there were sixty or seventy missionaries dispersed about the neglected settlements; the inhabitants in many populous towns had formed new congregations, and had built above sixty churches; an acquaintance with English theology led several sectarian ministers to conformity; and the increase of the Church kept some proportion even with the rapidly flowing tide of new settlers. Among those, who at the rise of the Society did the work of evangelists in America, were the excellent Dr. Bray, the founder of the association, which preserves his name;‡ James Blair, the friend of Waterland;§ and George Keith, whose conversion from Quakerism, and writings in defence of it, procured him the friendly notice of Charles Leslie. In 1733 the Society sent into Georgia a missionary, whose efforts have since had no slight influence on the religious character of America, and on whose character this voyage to America had probably no slight influence, in the person of John Wesley.

In the province of New York, perhaps the various character of the settlers, composed of as many different nations as Hannibal's army, and all alike in want of a religious provision, made them more kindly disposed to the ministers of the English Church; at least the missionaries were well received, eleven new churches were built in the city and other towns, and the congregations continued to increase. In Pennsylvania there was almost from the first a large body of conformists. Some resistance was threatened at the outset, but the members of the Society of Penn deserve the rare praise of having in very few instances converted the possession of power to an engine of persecution. It will not be thought, however, that the labour of the English missionary was superfluous here. The minister of an establishment must labour to promote conformity; and the garb of Quakerism, a religion without ordinances, was often assumed as a cloak for absolute irreligion.

Still the provision for these labourers was far from ample;

\* The fact is stated in Douglass's *North America*, vol. ii. p. 130.

† Trinity Church, founded in 1696.

‡ It is here only necessary to mention, that owing to his enterprising labours, thirty-nine parochial libraries were formed in America, chiefly in Maryland, where he resided as Commissary of the Bishop of London; and 34,000 religious books and tracts distributed during his stay in the country.

§ Author of the "Exposition of the Sermon on the Mount." He was for fifty-four years a missionary in America, the latter part of which time he was President of the College at Williamsburg in Virginia, which owes its foundation to his labours.



many wandered without a welcome; many died of diseases procured by fatigue or unhealthy change of climate; and so frequent were the calamities on the passage, that it is, perhaps, no exaggeration to say, the want of an episcopate in the country cost the lives of "one *fifth* of those who were destined for the service."\* No doubt many a poor English scholar, struggling with such discouragements, must have looked wistfully for any opportunity to return to his native land; and many relinquished their appointments in despair. Yet there were found men who even resigned advantageous lay-employments from love to the cause, and crossed the seas to obtain ordination;† others were patiently labouring in the plantations, instructing the negroes; and the Indians of the five nations, though this wild race has proved the most inaccessible to such efforts, were in some instances persuaded to receive a Christian missionary.‡ "I am banished," said the missionary Langhorne, writing to Dr. Townson—"I am banished to the *back side* of the world; but in my conduct I am not unmindful of such things as you and the clergy of Malpas would approve; and your influence and theirs is felt amidst savage bears and wolves in the woods of Mecklenburg and on the shores of the Ontario."

The most interesting record, however, of the struggles of the Church is that which relates to the New England Colonies, and is summarily contained in the well-written "Memoir of Dr. Samuel Johnson, of Connecticut," by Dr. Thomas Bradbury Chandler, whose daughter, Mary Goodin Chandler, was afterwards the wife of Bishop Hobart. Both these distinguished men were among the ablest of the native sons of the American Church; and its extension before the Revolution was owing very materially to their disinterested zeal and active service.

There can scarcely be a more instructive lesson than is presented in the natural progress of the religion of sects, when left to its own tendencies, unchecked by any counteracting force; and nothing can serve better to set in a proper light the conduct of the Church's friends in the New England provinces, than a slight retrospect of the previous state of religion in those provinces.

It is, we know, contrary to the common opinion, but we cannot bring ourselves to ascribe the same degree of moral energy and enlightened conscientiousness to those who expatriated themselves

\* Memorial of Hobart, p. 4.

† Among these was Clement Hall, a magistrate of North Carolina, who after obtaining ordination in England, continued to labour for fifteen years in missionary journeys, often endeavouring to instruct the negroes, and bringing old and young to the font of baptism. After many sufferings and losses, he died in 1759, having probably baptised about 10,000 persons.—*Reports of the Society*, 1760.

‡ Bishop Hobart, in 1818, on a visit to the Oneida Indians, found an aged Mohawk, firm in the Christian faith, and of exemplary life, who had been converted in childhood by the missionaries of the Society.—*Berrian*, p. 216.

to avoid bowing to an altar, hearing prayers read in a surplice, and a sermon from a pulpit, as to those who laid down their lives for the word of God and the integrity of the Christian sacraments. Among the first settlers in New England, there were, indeed, some persons of learning and ability who had been educated at the English universities, and brought into the new country some of that sterling lore which runs through the English theology of the seventeenth century. Their care to perpetuate education is attested by the early foundation of Harvard and Yale Colleges. The name of John Eliot must be ever sacred in the annals of missionary labours. Thomas Hooker, the friend of Baxter, Davenport, Blackman, Stone, and others, united with their fanatic peculiarities some more respectable attainments. But it may well be questioned whether the difficulties of education in an infant colony had so much to do with the rapid subsequent decay of learning, as the narrow bigotry of the settlers, the quarrels and schisms of their magistrates and ministers, their violent intolerance and gloomy superstition. As early as 1637, within twenty years after the first settlement, the Synod of New England had condemned *eighty-two* different heresies or erroneous opinions; laws were passed enforcing compliance with these decisions, and the woods and shores were filled with scattered flocks of new Nonconformists and new exiles. Attachment to the Book of Common Prayer had been repeatedly punished with *transportation* to England. Sir Ferdinando Gorges, coming out with a body of Church of England settlers, was compelled to return. Sir Henry Vane the younger, sent over as Governor by the Company in England, was not received because he declared for a toleration. The Anabaptists were fined, imprisoned, or expelled. But a worse fate awaited the unfortunate Quakers, of whom several were branded or lost their ears in the pillory; and four, one of whom was a woman, suffered death between 1656 and 1660.\*

When this cruelty had been checked by the restored government at home, and in some measure by the natural feelings of horror which these executions roused, the spirit was expelled only to return in another shape with an influence still more dreadful. There had been from time to time some few trials for witchcraft, taught, as it would appear, by the evil genius of the mother-

\* Such is the caprice of opinion, or the want of knowledge, or the consistent perseverance of calumny, that while the name of Laud is never wanted to point a sentence on persecution, (and yet his head was at least an equivalent for the ears of Prynne!) the New England Endicott, the Torquemada of his little world, is scarcely known but in the simple story of the Quaker historian.—*Sewell, Hist. of the Friends*, vol. i. p. 383, *et seq.* Charles II. soon after his restoration, sent orders which put a stop to these atrocities; but the colonial legislatures still kept up the system by fines and imprisonment, till this also was checked by an Order in Council of Queen Anne, in Harley's administration.

country, which was miserably visited with the same delusion during the Usurpation. But in the year 1692, the jealousy of a minister against his rival provoked a course of popular insanity, which there was no deliberate wisdom to controul. Twenty-eight persons were sentenced to death, nineteen, of whom fifteen were women, were hanged. Of more than three hundred who were accused, one hundred and fifty were punished with imprisonment, many pleading guilty, in order, as was usual in such cases, to escape with life. "All who suffered," says Cotton Mather, himself an active promoter of the prosecutions,\* "denied the crime to the death!"—calmly giving this statement as an infallible proof of the justice of their sentence. Their dead bodies, stripped and loosely covered with earth, were exposed to the wolves and foxes of the wilderness.

In the midst of such gloomy agitations, there were no doubt many who remembered their first love, and would gladly have recalled the decent order of the English ritual, with its heart-cheering solemnities. Before the end of the reign of Charles II. a party in Boston had petitioned the government at home for an English clergyman; and there was soon "a small congregation," says Cotton Mather, "worshipping God with the ceremonies of the Church of England."† In the course of the next half-century, with the aid of the Society then formed, the number of churches was trebled; and it is evident from cotemporary documents, that they comprised a fifth part of the population, and a greater proportion of the wealth of the New England capital.‡ But the dominant congregationalists had means within their reach, which still checked the progress of such heresy. Of seven ministers at Yale College, in 1722, who had persuaded themselves of the necessity of episcopal ordination, three were deterred, by fear of losing their appointments, from pursuing the course they had

\* Cotton Mather's Hist. b. vi. c. vii.

† Hist. b. i. c. vi. This was the congregation of "the King's Chapel," the chaplain who officiated receiving a salary of £100 per annum till the period of the revolt. The present state of this chapel and its endowments is singularly illustrative of New England character. "A rich old gentleman had bequeathed by his will a large sum of money to the King's Chapel, the interest to be paid to the preacher of a certain number of annual sermons on the Trinity. The testator having lived and died in the communion of the Church of England, of course no doubt could be entertained of his intention;—but the Revolution took place, and the congregation of the King's Chapel had cast off both king and creed, and had become not only republicans in politics, but Unitarians in religion. Under these circumstances, what was to be done with the legacy? This did not long remain a moot point. It was discovered that an Unitarian could preach sermons on the Trinity as well as the most orthodox Athanasian; and the effect of the testator's zeal for the diffusion of pure faith, has been to encourage the dissemination of doctrines, which of course he regarded as false and damnable."—Hamilton, vol. i. p. 101.

‡ Douglass, North America, vol. i. p. 542.

begun.\* Checkley, a bookseller at Boston, for reprinting "Leslie's Discourse on Episcopacy," in 1723, was found guilty of a seditious libel, and fled to England.† Prejudice was still so strong, that when Dr. Johnson explained to his congregation that the prayers which they had admired in his public services were taken from the Common Prayer Book, the disclosure led them only to desire his departure.

The calenture of the preceding century was now, as it was also in the mother-country, subsiding to a lethargy of contented indolence. Socinianism, or avowed infidelity, began to be diffused through the ill-accordant mass of society. Education had almost disappeared; only Harvard and Yale Colleges still kept up a sort of prescriptive training for the ministry. The students had, indeed, a heavy infliction in being required to recite weekly, by memory, the Assembly's Catechism in Latin, together with the metaphysical jargon of Ames's *Medulla*, and *Cases of Conscience*. There were few books in the country but such as had been imported with the first settlers a century before, of which new compendiums were made with the superadded dulness of later professors.‡

It cannot be said that the cause of learning and religion was entirely overlooked in England. The piety of Queen Mary had already been guided by the zeal of Blair to found a college, in revival of the plan of James I., at Williamsburg, in Virginia.§ Several of the first names of the age now combined to form a library for their kinsmen in the northern colonies, to which Sir Isaac Newton, Sir Richard Steele, Bishop White Kennet, Drs. Halley, Woodward and Bentley, were contributors. These, with Bishop Berkeley's noble donation of 1000 volumes, subsequently made, have rendered the library of Yale College what it still is, the most valuable, perhaps the only valuable library on the new continent.||

\* Chandler's *Life of Dr. Johnson*, p. 27.

† Waterland's *Correspondence*, Works, vol. x. p. 441.

‡ Chandler's *Life of Dr. Johnson*, p. 16.

§ This foundation is now revived, and under the able superintendence of Dr. Emple, a zealous episcopalian divine, is, we trust, subservient to the purposes for which it was endowed.

|| Hamilton, vol. i. p. 364. The want of good books must evidently be a want under which the advance of knowledge in America is much retarded. A correspondent of Hobart's, in Georgia, writes to ask him—"If you meet with any new works that are really good, and will assist me, be so kind as to purchase them for me; and also, if you are not using it, and if you do not feel any apprehension of its being lost on so long a voyage, lend me Bishop Taylor's '*Great Exemplar*,' &c."—*Berrin*, p. 141. One might suppose this to have been written in the age of manuscripts. It is a subject which seems to have met with the attention of Bishop Hobart's English friends, particularly the Rev. H. H. Norris, (*Ibid.* p. 209); but it is worth considering whether more might not be done by churchmen in this country to supply the theological seminaries in America.

The excellent Bishop Berkeley was, indeed, a character of whom the age he lived in was unworthy. It is a line altogether expressive of the man, which ascribes

“ To Berkeley every virtue under heaven.”

His name is now scarcely mentioned but as a metaphysical disputant—a writer of such things as serve to make a busy idleness. A slight acquaintance with what he wrote will show that he had no design to encourage this disease of learning. But of a life past in forwarding schemes of the most ardent benevolence, a disregard of all personal difficulties in pursuing a course marking alike the Christian philosopher and patriot, we have scarcely a record to remind us. Such zeal was but ill-requited by a court where Walpole was the minister, and Hoadley the accepted prelate.\* His “ Proposal for better Supplying the Churches in the American Plantation,” had shamed even that profligate government into a parliamentary grant to assist his charitable design. In the ardour of his hope, he himself took a voyage to the new continent, and with the powerful influence which such characters command over the virtuous sympathies of youth, he had persuaded several young men of talent at the University of Dublin, and others in England, to accompany him on the forlorn enterprise. But his projected college in the Bermudas, and all other efforts, were checked, when Walpole found means to divert the grant, and discouraged every hope of assistance. Still his short residence of two years in Rhode Island, 1729-31, was no slight encouragement to the rising Church: his private estate which he had purchased there was consigned to Yale College, and he continued during his life to confirm his American friends by his correspondence and example. There is much expressed in the wish of Dr. Johnson on his death-bed, that he might resemble his friend Berkeley in his death.

In the mean time other excellent men were labouring with no better success for the same object. It is well known what disappointments the proposers of the American Episcopate had to encounter. During Clarendon’s administration, letters patent were actually issued for the appointment of Dr. Alexander Murray, a companion of the king’s exile, to the Bishopric of the Colonies; but the Cabal succeeded to office, and all the claims of religion were forgotten.† The only design which subsequently reached maturity, when Queen Anne had determined to endow

\* There is something exquisitely odious in the style which Hoadley uses in speaking of Berkeley, when we recollect that this was the language of a man who *never visited* his poor Welsh diocese, respecting one whose philosophy was penned at hours stolen from those journeys in which he was willing to spend and to be spent for his brethren. “ Alciphron, the Minute Philosopher,” was written in America.

† Dr. Chandler, *Free Examination*, *init.* a tract written in defence of Archbishop Secker against the notorious Archdeacon Blackburne.

four colonial bishoprics from the monies obtained by sale of lands in St. Christopher's, was frustrated by her death. It was in vain that such men as Butler, Gibson, and Sherlock advocated the measure with a zeal worthy of their names. The question lingered till the accepted hour was past, and the last efforts of the meek and gentle-minded Secker only provoked the political rancour of a party in both countries, whose aim has ever been to confound the Apostolic order of the Church with imputed schemes of worldly ambition. Our colonies had attained to a population of nearly four millions; one fourth of these were nominally of the Established Church; yet to the majority of this great number the ministry of the Word and Sacraments was scantily supplied by private benevolence—to all, the Apostolic rite of Confirmation was alike unknown.

Such was the genius of an age, which lulled to self-complacency by the elegant lyre of Akenside, proud of its liberty, and dissolving the manly virtues in a sickly sentiment, awaited the whirlwind which overtook it at the close! Even in the higher ranks of clergy there were men who smiled on the efforts of Chubb and Tindal, and forgot their divine commission in the adulation of a court,

—“ Where truth by Hoadley's aid  
Shone thro' Imposture's solemn shade,  
Thro' kingly and thro' *sacerdotal* night !”

The Providence of God had still its end to work with a counter-acting force. What gentler spirits could not do, was in some degree brought round by the rude torrent of Methodism; and the doctrines of the Cross were again proclaimed to listening thousands on both shores. The effect of this religious revolution in America was more unfavourable to the Sects of the preceding Century, than to the Church-Societies that were newly rising there. When the hey-day of ill-governed zeal was past, the accession to the cause of the Church was easily apparent.\* It awakened a desire of enquiry equally removed from fanatic fervours and indolent security; and quiet spirits had their season, in the midst of much ignorance and prejudice, to scatter the seed which should spring up after many days. The writings of Johnson and Chandler recommended the cause of Episcopacy with equal force and learning, against Mayhew and Chauncey, whose opposition was inflamed with political animosity. Johnson died full of years in 1772; his friend continued his pious labours till other changes overtook him. The little sketch which Dr. Berrian has given of Dr. Chandler's mode of life, at Elizabeth Town, New Jersey, is striking from the personal character of the man, as well as from the resemblance which we recognize to the English Country Clergyman of the last age.

\* Chandler's *Life of Johnson*, p. 67.



"The salary of Dr. Chandler as a Missionary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel was £50 sterling a year; on which with some slight contributions from the congregation, a parsonage and small glebe, he lived with such a degree of ease and comfort and with such a free and unlimited hospitality as are remembered by many who are still living, both with wonder and pleasure. I have scarcely ever met with any aged person belonging to our Church who had visited Elizabeth Town, that did not delight in recalling the many happy hours which he had spent in that agreeable family, and at that hospitable board.

"Extensively as Dr. Chandler was known and respected by strangers, he was still more beloved by his parishioners and friends. Cheerful in his temper, easy and accessible in his intercourse with others,—fond of study, of retirement and rural pursuits, but yet of blending and sweetening them with social enjoyment, remaining much at home, and from an aversion to preaching any where else, *never out of his own pulpit*, it was natural that his affability, his kindness, his constant presence and unintermitted labours should greatly endear him to his people."—*Berrian*, p. 72.

But the jealousies which continued to arise between the colonists and the mother country were now preparing to burst into open violence. The neglect of Walpole, and the splendid successes under Chatham formed a contrast of circumstances alike unfavourable to the affections of the people in America. Yet the state of things and of men's minds previously to the rupture is much misconceived. It is a statement which may surprise, but which is confirmed by one who had good opportunities of judging, that the republican armies were recruited more with Britons than Americans; and that there was a greater proportion of native Americans on the side of the Loyalists.\* One part at least of the statement may be more easily credited at a time when these shores are pouring forth legions to fight the battles of malcontents all over the world. There are few however who will not now admit the soundness of the views which Dean Tucker, in his "*Cui Bono*," expressed at an early period of the war. It has been no loss to England; and the mature growth of a colony becomes at length a proper claim for its independence. We have forgotten our animosities; and the Americans have no object in retaining theirs: "*Juniores post victoriam, etiam senes inter bella civium nati: quotusquisque reliquus, qui monarchiam viderit?*"

How the Church was then overwhelmed in the strife of tongues, when her best and worthiest fled, or retired to deep obscurity; the bolder assertors of the loyal cause felt the violence of popular fury, the friends of liberty were distrusted by their own countrymen, and met with scarcely a milder fate, it is now only painful to recall. Inglis, Boucher, and a few distinguished men, found a home and preferment in this country; Chandler, forced like them,

\* *Jon. Boucher's American Revolution*,



to leave America for some years, not less honourably declined preferment offered. Seabury, whose writings are worthy of the best days of English Theology, after his obscure consecration in Scotland, returned as Bishop to the languishing Church in Connecticut, but his Episcopate was scarcely acknowledged, and he lived chiefly supported by a pittance derived from a few friends in England. Provoost and White at length emerging from retirement, and assembling a few Episcopalians in the first Convention of their Church, were elected Bishops and proceeded in 1786 to England for consecration. Such was the state of feeling against all that bore resemblance to a British institution, that when the friends of Chandler began to re-build the sacred edifice where he had preached, they were compelled with arms in their hands to watch the walls by night, to prevent the work of the day from being destroyed.\*

Scarcely could these feelings be said to have subsided, when Hobart commenced his ministry. But his was a mind not to be deterred by difficulties. Strong in his reliance on a higher Power, he laboured in the work of restoring what was fallen. "The mortar that had been tempered with so many tears could not but outlast all the flints and marbles of human confidence."† After passing the first two years in a charge at Hempstead, New Jersey, he was in 1800 invited to become Assistant Minister of Trinity Church: and from his acceptance of this offer his public life began its distinguished career.

He became at once remarkable for his peculiar talent as a preacher:

"His discourses," says Dr. Berrian, "were written with all the freedom and glow of youthful feeling: and if not bearing the test of rigid criticism, were yet exceedingly acceptable to the great body of the people. The evangelical spirit which they always breathed—the bold and direct appeals which they addressed to the hearts and consciences of men—the indifference which he himself felt to the world, that made others more sensible of its emptiness and vanity; all these things were calculated to arouse the attention of his hearers, to awaken their zeal, inflame their piety, and urge them on with increasing diligence in their Christian course."

"The effect of his manner was also increased by his preaching *memoriter*, a practice which he adopted from his extreme short-sightedness, and which gave to his sermons the ease and animation of extemporaneous discourses. The striking characteristics of his eloquence were never materially altered; and while his discourses were greatly improved in their arrangement, matter, and style, they were to the last delivered with remarkable animation and force."—*Berrian*, p. 78, 79.

\* Dr. Radd's Historic Notices of St. John's Church, New Jersey, p. 17.

† Bishop Hall.

His duties as a pastor, in a very populous cure, he performed with conscientious fidelity and zeal.

"No considerations of ease or pleasure were suffered to interfere with any parochial call; the engagements of company whether at home or abroad, were interrupted,—study was laid aside. In his visitation of the sick, the ease and freedom of his manner, united with the greatest tenderness and delicacy, at once removed embarrassment, and drew forth from those with whom he conversed an unrestrained expression of their feelings and views. The readiness with which he adapted his remarks and Scriptural quotations to the respective circumstances of their case, gave to all that he said a peculiar interest and force; and the impression was made still deeper by the solemnity and fervour with which he offered up the prayers. But regarding his vow as not limiting his visits to the sick, he devoted much of his time to conversation with those who were well, whenever an opportunity was given;—among these he mingled with the easy familiarity of a friend, imposing no restraint on their cheerful enjoyments, but often seasoning common discourse with such words as 'might minister grace to the hearers.' How are the recollections of these happy hours awakened in thousands, with a gush of tenderness that they can be enjoyed no more!"—p. 80, 81.

It was one of his earliest tasks to write or re-publish such familiar books of doctrine or devotion, as would best render the comforts of religion accessible to the poor, and its duties engaging to the young. With this view he printed the *Christian's Manual*, *Nelson on the Festivals and Fasts*, the *Clergyman's Companion*, and *Stevens on the Nature and Constitution of the Christian Church*, the last with several additions and corrections of his own. He wrote an *Exposition of the Church Catechism in question and answer*, a *Companion to the Book of Common Prayer*, and a *Companion to the Altar*. All these were produced with a rapidity proportioned to the wants of the community for which he wrote; and considering the age of the writer, and his laborious daily duties, in the midst of a society possessing so few literary advantages, their accuracy in doctrinal statements is very remarkable. The *Companion to the Altar* in particular, was written in the space of about four weeks: and notwithstanding some defects of style and diffuseness of thought, its deep devotional spirit and power of persuading the heart have rendered it a constant manual to the communicant in the American Church. All these writings have gone through several editions in America, and deserve to be better known in this country.

The *Companion to the Altar* is further remarkable for its having given rise to a controversy, which contributed still more to serve the cause of Episcopacy. Some passages in Hobart's book, where he had maintained the necessity of Episcopal Ordination, had displeased a Dr. Mason, Pastor of the Associate-Reformed

Church in New York, a character of some literary eminence, who, in the confidence of established reputation, attacked the Companion to the Altar in a style of caustic bitterness, less to his own credit than to the advantage of his opponent. This drew from Hobart, in 1807, his *Apology for Apostolic Order*, a work which contains an admirable digest of the evidence for Episcopacy, drawn up with equal learning and acuteness. The controversy soon attracted notice on this side the Atlantic, and Hobart was gratified by its leading to a correspondence with Bishop Skinner and other Scottish Episcopalians, with Archdeacon Daubeney, and many living friends of truth and order in this country. It is to be regretted that too much space is allotted to the desultory remarks of Dr. Mason, which lose their interest with an English reader. Hobart himself was sensible of this, and wished to have re-published it in a form divested of these personal allusions. If this had been done, and it might still be done by some friend to Hobart's fame, we fully agree with Dr. Berrian that it would rank among the best works on this important question. Hobart, however, found his time too much occupied in other valuable labours, and had no leisure for revision.

It is remarked by a late traveller in the United States, that Trinity Church is "the most richly endowed establishment in the Union."\* To the English reader it may be necessary to explain the circumstances of this establishment, as it has been the means of much good to the cause of Christianity in this part of America; and it is honourable to the government of New York to have respected the property destined to this sacred use, when the spoliation in other provinces was so unsparing.† The land allotted to this Church before the Revolution remained untouched at the restoration of peace; and as it was contiguous to the most flourishing city in the states, its value has been from time to time greatly augmented. The laws of the Republic, however, having limited the quantity of property allowed to be possessed by a corporation, portions of this land have at various intervals been sold, and the funds employed in building churches and promoting the means of Christian knowledge in other parts of the province.

Here is a fact of some value at a moment when the case of America is so stoutly appealed to by a party who are charitably labouring to ease the Church at home from its establishment, that is, from its endowments, in which the main offence consists. The case of America is by no means a perfect precedent. In New England the endowment of the congregational churches is

\* Hamilton, vol. i. p. 47.

† A grant of valuable lands, the gift of the Society for Propagating the Gospel, has recently been restored to the Church in the State of Vermont, which looks for a large augmentation from this source.—*New York Churchman's Almanac*, 1834.

still generally preserved. The sects of longer standing in the middle states are not without endowed institutions; and where the endowments are the most scanty, as might be expected, the religion of the people is at its lowest ebb.\* To a large part of the slave states, and to the backwoodsmen in general, the forms of public worship and the rites of Christianity are alike unknown.

It is a fact, which is also kept studiously out of sight, that the governments in many of the states have interfered to promote public institutions for the education of the community. This was an object which Washington knew how to value; and one of the latest acts of his public life was to recommend to his countrymen "a national system of education to assimilate the manners of the people."† Where this care is embraced in any degree by the government, *the principle of an establishment is admitted*. It is true that some of their public documents breathe a spirit adverse to such institutions; laws for the observance of the Sabbath and other salutary moral restrictions have met with but indifferent success:—and the failure has been hailed as a new triumph by all who wish to drink the cup of democracy to the dregs. The good sense, however, and the religious feeling of the people has not given full effect to these transports.

It will not be thought any disparagement to the labours of Hobart, that his early appointment at Trinity Church placed him at once in the vicinity of that body of Churchmen who were best able to aid his large designs. Without aid of this kind no human efforts in the holiest cause can command permanent success; and it should be held the highest praise to employ such aid successfully. The little that had been previously done, and the great efforts which were subsequently made, sufficiently attest the value of his counsels and the promptitude of his zeal.

The want of means for theological education was one of the greatest difficulties which was felt by the Episcopal Church. The total absence of any public institution of this kind amidst a rapidly increasing population, the consequent want of encouragement to young candidates for the ministerial office, leading to an inadequate supply of clergy, the scanty acquirements of many who were already in orders, were evils which he could not but deplore.

\* See some facts relative to the state of Rhode Island in our number for April, 1832, pp. 317—321. The evil is, however, of no recent date. Long before the Revolution this colony was the seat of a fraudulent paper currency, piracy, and internal anarchy. Here was also the detestable community of the Gortonists, whose premature extinction must have left a clearer stage for Owen of Lanark. The Rhode-Island judicial oath, "Upon the peril of the penalty of perjury!" may be recommended to all who admire the plan of separating Christianity from the law of the land.—*Douglass, North America*, vol. i.

† In his address to Congress, previously to resigning his office as President.

“ He was strongly impressed,” says his biographer, “ with the great and urgent necessity of establishing a seminary on such a large and liberal scale as would be suited to the wants, the interests and dignity of the Church. The first evidence of his solicitude on this point was shown in the formation of a society in 1806, which was to be an humble handmaid to that better system, which shortly after he endeavoured to bring into form and existence.”—p. 111.

Of this society, which was named “ The Protestant Episcopal Theological Society,” an interesting account is given in Dr. Berrian’s Memoir. Their weekly meetings included a discussion of theological questions, a delivery of an essay or sermon, and an exercise in pulpit eloquence. An Office of Devotion was composed for these meetings by Hobart, and it is one well calculated to quicken a sense of the clergyman’s obligations. One of the prayers in behalf of the candidates for the ministry we extract.

“ Holy Spirit, Almighty Sanctifier of the Faithful, enrich these persons with thy heavenly graces. Inspire them with deep humility and distrust of themselves, with ardent piety and love to God, with humble and holy confidence in their Saviour. Teach them constantly to invoke thy enlightening and sanctifying power, and in thy strength to war against all the temptations of the world. May they regard its highest pleasures with holy indifference, and press forward for the prize of their high calling in Christ Jesus. Sanctify them by thy truth, that they may be preserved from the evil that is in the world. Amen.”—p. 117.

Still advocating the cause which he had taken in hand, in 1808 he originated a work entitled the Churchman’s Magazine, which he continued for some years to conduct with much ability and success, till, as the burden of weightier cares increased, he found a successor animated with the same mind to relieve him. Many similar publications have since found support in other parts of the Union, to which this may be considered to have led the way. His public engagements were at this time no slight accession to his parochial charge. He was an active member of several literary institutions, and was filling offices of trust in most of the religious societies connected with the Church in his province. For business of this nature his talents were admirably adapted; and the influence thus gained was well calculated to prepare the way for his ascendancy in the counsels of the Church.

Bishop Moore, the second Protestant Bishop of New York, was now incapacitated by infirmities from exercising the episcopal office. The merits of Hobart had long pointed him out as fittest to undertake the “ good work;” and accordingly he was in 1810 elected Assistant Bishop of the Province, by the suffrages of the great body of clergy and laity; notwithstanding an unworthy opposition, which private jealousy or hostility to his principles had

raised. His conduct after his elevation conciliated most of those who had been misled by the author of this opposition; the author himself felt it in the ruin of his own reputation.\*

He was now able more effectually to pursue those objects which he had most at heart, and one of the first was to establish a college for the education of an Episcopal ministry. He had himself some years before purchased a farm in New Jersey, beautifully situated, which he designed for the site of such a college; wishing, no doubt, if he had found it practicable, to place it as far as possible from the crowd of a great city. This part of his plan however he was reluctantly compelled to abandon. It is scarcely possible in our circumstances to appreciate the embarrassments attending the progress of his labours. After his Pastoral Letters and Charges had in some measure prepared churchmen to entertain the measure, the want of adequate funds, the difficulty of union among isolated parties of churchmen in remote provinces, the rival claims of these different provinces, all rendered the ecclesiastical policy as impracticable as the federal government. Yet the institution was organized; in 1817 the General Convention of the Episcopal Church laid the foundation of the General Theological Seminary at New York; this, through the agency of other interests was, in 1820, transferred to New Haven in Connecticut; but, in 1822, again restored to New York, where we trust it has now obtained a permanent establishment. Hobart took upon himself the gratuitous labours of a professor in this Seminary, which he continued during the remainder of his life. Many excellent men among the laity of the province contributed their donations or bequests; and in one remarkable instance the bishop, with noble disinterestedness, diverted a legacy intended for himself to the aid of this public purpose.†

In a country like America, where, as Hobart used to say, there are all the sects of England, Scotland and Ireland, *and a few*

\* Berrian, p. 136.

† A better notion of his anxious solicitude in this cause can scarcely be supplied than from the following anecdote. A wealthy and charitable member of the corporation of Trinity Church, to whom, as being without children or other near claimants on his recollection, the Bishop had pleaded in behalf of the Theological Seminary, was lately dead. "On the day following the Bishop was dining with me, and his mind naturally turning to this subject, he indulged in a variety of conjectures as to the amount of the bequest. The modesty and silence of Mr. Sherred in regard to his intentions made the Bishop somewhat apprehensive of the result. 'I am afraid,' he said, 'it may not be more than a scholarship or a fellowship; but if it should be a professorship,—I always thought well of him—but I shall then think he has acted nobly.' Impatient to learn what had actually been done, he left the table early; but in a short time returned almost breathless with haste, and full of gratitude and joy cried out, 'he has left us half his fortune!' "—*Berrian*, p. 251.



*more*, (for the Dumplers, Shakers, Mormonists, and some others, are known to us by name only,) a bishop must be as well prepared to defend the outworks as to build. No one can be acquainted with the character or writings of Hobart without observing how strictly he maintained what are invidiously called high church principles: and it may be matter of surprise to some to learn what success attended their promulgation in America. This was indeed so essential a part of his public conduct, that it cannot justly be passed over without a brief notice. Not Hickey or Leslie were more rigid upholders of apostolical succession; and no doubt the sense of his high calling led him to be the more intent on his duties. A friend, whose opinions he much valued, as those of a scholar and divine, had proposed to him the plan of a periodical, in which it was intended to treat only of those subjects in which most Christians agree, and to exclude those more controverted points which would hinder its general circulation. His answer was:—

“Whether such a plan, however feasible in theory, is capable of being reduced to practice, or whether, if carried into execution, it would not exclude from the work many important doctrines of Christianity, are inquiries which appear to me worthy of consideration. But, in my view, the points on which our Church differs from other societies of Christians constitute her beauty and her glory. That the offering of Christ is a perfect sacrifice, propitiation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; that the work of renovation, begun in baptism, the sacrament of regeneration, is gradual and progressive; that after grace given, we may finally fall away; with other doctrines that might be enumerated—appear to me fundamental tenets of our church: in which, however, there is very far from being a coincidence between her and other denominations of Christians. That it is evident unto all men, diligently reading Scripture and ancient authors, that from the Apostles’ times there have been three orders of ministers, bishops, priests, and deacons: and that no man can be accounted a lawful minister in the Church who hath not had Episcopal ordination; that a liturgy for public worship is sanctioned by Scripture, by primitive practice, and is most decent and proper;—are points in which it is not to be supposed that churchmen can differ from one another, however they may differ from dissenters.

“In my humble judgment, a publication which does not support and defend these points, gives up the distinctive principles of our church, which her brightest luminaries defended while living, and consecrated in their deaths, and ceases to contend for Christianity in her primitive, purest, and fairest form. Some of these principles may be unpopular, and though indeed they can alone permanently secure “the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace,” the advocates of them may be supposed to be influenced by a sectarian spirit. But this imputation ought not to have any more effect in deadening their zeal than the opprobrium of



being "a sect everywhere spoken against" had on the first defenders of the Christian Church.

"Satisfied too I am, that the display of these principles, and the zealous defence of them, have most essentially contributed to revive and increase our church. In a late visitation through the diocese, in company with Dr. Bowden, I found some of the most enlightened and zealous members of our Church, and persons of influence and standing in society, who traced either their conversion to the Church, or the confirmation of their attachment to it, to the display and defence of its principles; and most certainly to the same cause may be traced the zeal and spirit of the young men in this quarter who have lately entered the ministry or are now preparing for it. . . . . *When these discriminating principles are forgotten, or when they cease to influence the members of our communion, that Church which we have been accustomed to revere as apostolic and primitive, will be merged in the mass of Christian sects, certainly having very inferior pretensions to these sacred titles.*

"I know you will not be displeased at the candour with which I address you. I cannot repress the apprehension that your views of the best mode of advancing the interests of our Church, differ in some respects from those which, in common with many others, I have been accustomed to entertain. Yet that very liberality, which I sometimes fear, will prompt you to believe me sincere in the sentiment, that the prudent, the resolute and dispassionate defence of those doctrines, of that ministry, and of that worship, which distinguish our Church from other Christian societies, is not incompatible with the promotion of the endearing charities of life, with strengthening the bonds of society, but is in fact the surest way of extending the kingdom of the Redeemer."—*Berrian*, p. 142, 143.

On the same principle he was adverse to the American Bible Society, to which his old and esteemed friend Bishop White had given his support.

"These societies," he said, "appear to me erroneous in the principle, on which, in order to secure general co-operation, they are founded,—*the separation of the Church from the Word of God—of the Sacred Volume from the Ministry, the worship and the ordinances which it enjoins as of Divine institution, and the instruments of the promotion and preservation of Gospel-truth.*

"It is not to the distribution of the Bible, but to the mode of distribution that our objections apply. We deem ourselves not warranted in sanctioning what appears to us a *departure from the Apostolic mode of propagating Christianity.* And we think that Episcopalians will best preserve their attachment to the distinctive principles of their Apostolic Church, and best advance the cause of primitive Christianity, and most effectually avoid all collision with their fellow Christians who differ from them, by associating for religious purposes only among themselves."—*Address to Convention*, 1822. *Berrian*, p. 268.

The effect of these declarations, often publicly made, is re-

corded by his biographer to have been seen in the increased support of the religious institutions strictly connected with the church. Several auxiliary Bible and Common Prayer Book Societies were formed in different parts of the state; and the cordial co-operation of the laity with the sentiments of a Pastoral Letter addressed to them on this subject, left him no cause to regret having taken the unpopular side of the question in firm persuasion of its truth.\*

His own labours in the service of these societies were unremitting. Not confining his attention to the more extensive plans of promoting Christian knowledge, he actively shared in the humblest practical means of usefulness. The children of the Sunday schools, the young men who were training as catechists or preparing for distant missions, all partook of his parental superintendence and animating encouragement. A missionary settlement among the Oneida Indians, though distant many hundred miles in the interior, he twice visited in person. The address of these simple people to their Christian father, and his answer, conceived in the peculiar style of their language, yet embodying so much intelligible Christian truth, are among the most interesting documents recorded in Dr. Berrian's Memoir.†

\* There is much discernment shown in Dr. Berrian's remark on the candour of the laity in regard to such questions. "The laity, engrossed in a great measure with other pursuits, are but little accustomed to think on those disputed points of principle and policy which divide divines; but if they give them a careful and serious examination they are not only apt to come to just and sound conclusions, but to be zealous and consistent in their defence. Their opinions are adopted on their own merits, without regard to what may be thought of them by others. Their reputation and interests are not affected by their religious views, and therefore they can entertain them in quietness and peace. But it is not always so with the clergy: the prevailing tone of public sentiment where they may happen to be placed; the pride of maintaining consistency; the fear of censure in the uncompromising defence of truth; and above all, the love of popular praise—often exert a strong but insensible influence over their minds, and give them such a wrong bias as no force of reasoning can correct. This is no impeachment of their honesty and sincerity; it is the almost unavoidable operation of circumstances on the infirmity of human nature. The laity have their own temptations, but they are not exposed in the same degree to these; and hence they are as a body more free and unembarrassed in the adoption and maintenance of their religious opinions."—p. 163.

† The settlement at Oneida Castle now consists of more than two hundred warriors with their wives and children, who are members of the Episcopal church, and under the charge of one of her ministers; they have a church and the service is the liturgy; (which, together with a part of the Book of Genesis and the Gospel of St. Mark, was in 1787 translated into their language;) "they appear," says a spectator of one of Bishop Hobart's visits, "to unite in the service with much seriousness and devotion;—the responses were made in an audible and solemn tone, and a few verses from the Psalms translated into Indian, were chanted forth by hundreds of voices." Ninety-seven of their adults, in 1829, received from Bishop Hobart the rite of confirmation.—*New York Christian Journal*, Sept. 1829. Another Indian church, with great promise of success, has been more recently founded at Green Bay, in the Michigan territory. "The Indians," says their present missionary, "are zealously attached to the Episcopal church, viewing it as the church of their forefathers. They revert with pleasure to the time when the Society for Propagating the Gospel sent a faithful labourer among them."—p. 216, 225.

Nor was the aid of the press forgotten among these multiplied duties. The Bible of the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge was under his directions reprinted in America. An excellent treatise which he wrote, served much to recommend the apostolic rite of Confirmation. Neglecting nothing which could tend to edifying, he also published several sermons and charges, which are among the most finished of his compositions, and present no unfavourable specimen of his peculiar eloquence. Some of these briefly exhibit the points of difference between the Romish church and the primitive model; others relate to the more immediate concerns of his diocese, and it is pleasing to trace in them the progress of his labours in the public mind.

The time was, however, approaching when such labours could no more be safely continued. His own ardour exhausted the support that nature gave. His health had more than once given way on the distant and protracted journeys which duty required; and at length it was perceived to be so impaired, that nothing but a change of scene and perfect relaxation could restore him. In the autumn of 1823 he set out on his voyage to England.

“ A throng of his parishioners and friends pressed round him at the moment of his departure with anxious and sorrowing hearts to bid him farewell; and some felt but little less than the Ephesian converts in parting with St. Paul, from the painful apprehension “ that they might see his face no more.” Most of his clergy who were resident in the city accompanied him many miles, and then watched with fond and anxious regret the last glimpse of the sails that bore him hence.”—*Berrian*, p. 360.

How he was received here by the prelates of the English church, by his correspondents and friends, and what a remarkable influence his character and conversation gained over those who then saw him for the first time, will be fresh in the remembrance of many whose eye these pages may meet. It is a happiness to the writer of this brief tribute to recall the benevolent and expressive features of the portrait prefixed to Dr. Berrian's Memoir, as they were seen at the London social board, in the cathedral walk, or at the village parsonage, and by the waterfall in Wales, which he declared he could gaze on with delight, though he had seen Niagara. In truth it was a grievous injustice to accuse Hobart of want of reverence for “ England or the English:” it were well if some among ourselves loved our country and its institutions with as filial a spirit. Long before he had set foot on these shores, he wrote thus to a friend, who on a visit to this country had detailed some of the minor grievances a stranger meets with.

“ *New York, July 9th, 1803.*

“ I can enter perfectly into the state of your feelings with respect to the English. You never were very partial to them, and the selfish pursuits of a dissipated metropolis are not well calculated to increase your esteem for them. In London you certainly see the English character at the worst. Among the genteel country families I am told it wears a very different and far more amiable aspect. The English are certainly not quick in their feelings,—it is not easy to obtain a place in their hearts,—they even view strangers with jealousy till they find them worthy of their esteem ; but I have always supposed that when a person once obtained a familiar footing with them, they would go great lengths to please him. And they certainly possess, above every other nation in the world, the means of doing so. It is one thing to possess those qualities that in an instant seize upon your affections ; it is another to possess those that preserve and increase permanent regard. The pride of the English may be inordinate and repulsive, but it is a pride that disdains affectation, that scorns to use the easy coin of professions. I am persuaded that were you thrown out of those selfish and cunning circles in which business now leads you to move, and to remain some time out of the metropolis, your amiable heart would find those on whom it would repose. Did I wish to flirt away a few weeks, to awaken and gratify my volatile feelings, I would *visit* France. Did I wish to obtain permanent enjoyment, to expand my mind where the most noble principles, the most useful pursuits, and the most solid virtues have flourished for centuries, I would *take up my abode* in England.”—*Berrian*, p. 87.

Nor can we forbear extracting part of a letter to his daughters from England, in which he dwells on the charms of its rural scenery with a freshness of imagination which seems the peculiar gift of an affectionate spirit.

“ *York, Dec. 9th, 1823.*

——“ The first day that I rode into the country from Liverpool, on my way to London, I seemed in a new world. The hedges, not then stripped of their leaves, which divided the farms into numerous compartments, verdant as the finest meadows are with us in the richness of the spring ; the substantial and neat farm-houses, with their barns and buildings, their stacks of grain and hay arranged with a neatness of which our country affords no example ; the large mansions of the nobility and gentry towering in an extensive and beautiful lawn studded with the stately oak and elm, among which you sometimes perceived the deer roaming ; and even the humble cottage, with its little court-yard, sometimes scarcely large enough to turn in, fenced with a hedge, and crowded with flowers and rose bushes, the ever-blooming rose appearing as full as the monthly rose does with us in the spring ; the towns, with their thickly arranged buildings, which, from their antique appearance, brought to my mind the ages that were past long since ; *the stone churches*, with their pointed arched windows and doors, and their stately towers, or lofty spires ; and the rude hamlets, with their thatched houses moss-grown,

and which looked as if they were built centuries ago, with vines creeping along and covering their stone walls and concealing their Gothic windows, partly raised into their roofs, and the shrubbery and the grass-plot which almost invariably meet the eye;—this was the novel scene which struck me with astonishment and delight; and if it be thus in the autumn and winter, when the beauties of the country are departed, what must those beauties be when shining forth in the light, and splendour, and richness of spring!”—p. 278.

We must not dwell upon his visit to Wordsworth at Rydal, or to Southey at Keswick, nor on his mention of many excellent prelates and clergymen, by whom he was entertained while he remained among us. We must refer the reader to Dr. Berrian for an interesting account of his reception among the Scottish Episcopalians, whose lot is cast in circumstances so resembling his own. Nor must we follow him in his subsequent journeyings on the continent, fearing the reader of classic taste might be offended by his postponing the Appennine to the Catskill mountains, his contempt of Minerva's olive, and slight notice of the climate of Italy and the Eternal City. Indeed, in spite of the charms of ‘Corinne,’ we have some sympathy with the *cis-montane* proverb,

Inglese Italianato  
E diavolo incarnato,

and we love no man of English stock the less for extolling his native land by the comparison.

His return to New-York after two years absence was hailed with so warm a greeting, as made his heart melt with joy. Every one seemed to have recovered a dear and personal friend, of whose safety they had before despaired. A more deep and heartfelt greeting pervading all ranks was never given to any one on his restoration to his native land.

Can it be wondered that at such a time his ardent spirit should have expressed itself in terms of affection to his friends, countrymen, and brothers, heightened beyond the limits of truth by a contrast with the state of things in England? On the Sunday after his return he preached that sermon, which when it was read in this country provoked more animadversion than it merited, and yet gave his English friends a task of some labour to defend him. Dr. Berrian speaks wisely and temperately of this sermon and its critics. It was a question on which a better acquaintance with England might have taught Hobart a sounder judgment; and a better acquaintance with America might have taught some among ourselves a more charitable construction. It was natural he should look with honest pride on the success of a different system familiar to him from infancy; it was consistent with his often avowed opinions; and after all, where is the great offence, if he

preferred to view the Church of England, which he loved to call "the glory of the Reformed Churches," rather as a spiritual Society, than as the ally of a state so different from his own.\* We hasten on to other matters equally important and less known in this country.

The annual convention of his diocese was held soon after his arrival; when an occasion offered to show that he was at least as incapable of servile concession to his friends when he thought them wrong, as he was glad to share in their flow of sympathy before.

"The feelings of the clergy and laity from all parts of the state were in unison with those which prevailed in the city, and there was therefore a general desire to make a public demonstration of them. But though there were none who did not wish to unite in this testimony of gratitude for the happy return of the Bishop, yet there were a few who, not agreeing with him in some of his opinions, and in the main points of his policy, were anxious that the resolutions should be so framed as merely to express their sentiments of personal attachment and respect, and their high sense of his usefulness, piety, and worth. With a view to render it an unanimous act, some of his friends, who agreed with him in all points, unhappily yielded to this consideration; and in a spirit of accommodation, as unusual as it was unwise, drew them up in such a vague and general form, as deprived them of all force, character, and value. The Bishop had met his clergy and people with a generous warmth, which was most cordially reciprocated. He knew that, with very few exceptions, they were of one heart and one soul. He knew on what accounts he was particularly distinguished and esteemed. Any good and amiable prelate, however weak, irresolute, and wavering, might have received this praise:—he rose in his place, and in the bitterness of a wounded affection, rejected it with scorn. Never," says his biographer, "did I hear any person, in voice, manner, or expression so eloquent. It was all nature, feeling, and passion, wrought up to the highest pitch. He represented this proceeding as a crafty device of his opposers, and an act of weak compliance from his friends. Under the appearance of congratulation and praise, it left out all notice of the characteristic and prominent parts of his policy, which had been, through evil report and good report, the labour of his life, and in which he placed his glory and his pride. It neither exhibited him as he was known at home, nor as he was valued abroad. It was not agreeable to the just and affectionate tribute which had been presented to him on his departure, nor was it the kind of commendation which he coveted on his return. It was a weakened and diluted praise in no way applicable to one who had always stemmed the current of popular opinion, and he therefore requested that the resolution should be expunged from the minutes.

"This is the mere faint recollection of a speech which was so bold and powerful as to bow the hearts of the whole assembly as of one man. The justice and force of it were in the main universally felt. The particular friends of the Bishop were grieved at the pain they had given

\* Such is the language of his Convention Sermon in 1814.



him, and mortified by the error into which they had fallen. The resolutions were modified in such a way as to give them an appropriate character; and this fearless vindication, so far from being regarded as a display of arrogance and pride, was considered as a proof of that elevation of mind, which glories in an honourable course rather than in undistinguishing and popular applause."—p. 362, 363.

The last remarkable public act of his life is one which strongly illustrates the same energy of character; and as it involves principles applicable to other religious associations, which we have lately witnessed, it seems desirable to give a somewhat more detailed account of it.

In 1828, the plan of a clerical association was formed at New York, the object of which was stated to be "the promotion of the personal piety and official usefulness of its members by devotional exercises, and by conversation on missionary and such other religious subjects as might conduce to mutual edification." The purity of intention with which it was originated, and the laudable objects it professed, might have deceived a common observer; but Hobart perceived at once the evils from which such associations are inseparable. He accordingly proceeded by private diligence to explain to the projectors his apprehensions, with an earnest request that the project might be abandoned. Whether from misconception of his reasons, or an unwillingness to recede from a plan in which they had already embarked, his request was not complied with. The association was organized, and efforts were made to extend it in the province. It was plain that a line of distinction was about to be drawn between those who should unite with it, and those who should not; the Church would be divided by two factions. It was "one of the most harassing events of a trying episcopate of eighteen years." To take steps publicly to oppose it was to express his disapprobation of the course pursued by some of the most popular and influential of his presbyters, for whom he entertained a sincere esteem. To shrink from so opposing it was to consult his own ease at the expense of duty, and to open a door to the discords he foresaw.

His part was therefore chosen with the same temperate firmness which had always characterised his public conduct, and he was rewarded by the general approbation of his diocese. With the concurrence of those friends on whose opinion he could best rely, he drew up his last Pastoral Letter, fenced with so many admirable reasons for the part he had taken, that we trust the Church in America will never forget the prudent and religious foresight by which it was dictated.\* He reminded his people of the "Prophe-

\* We fear no copy of this valuable letter has reached this country. Our account is therefore taken from Dr. Berrian's summary. *Mem.* p. 388.



syings" of the elder Puritans under Elizabeth, and the origin of Methodism; he pointed out with great force the impossibility of promoting personal piety by public associations,—the inconsistency of the organized meeting, its secretary, and minute-book, with "that converse in which congenial friends pour into each other's bosoms their thoughts and their trials;"—*the inevitable consequence of such associations being turned into engines of party*, injurious to episcopal authority, and creative of an irresponsible independent power.

"In all plans of disputed policy," he concludes, "the question ought to be, *Can we do without them?* No one will for a moment pretend that these associations are *essential* to the personal piety, official usefulness, or edification of the clergy. This would be to cast a libel on the thousands and hundreds of thousands of ministers, who without these means have pursued, as burning and shining lights, their luminous course to the bright day of heavenly glory. Let a clergyman in private read and meditate and pray. Above all let him cherish the *spirit* of supplication; lifting up at all times and in all places, unseen and unnoticed by the world, but seen and heard by his heavenly Master, his heart and affections, in prayer for every spiritual blessing which he needs as a Christian and as a minister of the Lord. In the social circle of his brethren, in those clerical meetings which the various exigencies of the Church render necessary, and in the more confined group of those whom congenial tempers draw together, let him indulge, as opportunity offers, in converse on all points by which he may be excited or edified. He will enjoy sufficient means of personal piety and edification.

"In these exercises, which have been tested and found adequate to their holy end, by a series of the most pious and faithful ministers who in successive ages have adorned the Church, there can be no unballowed intrusion of vanity, ostentation, or vainglorious strife, or of the restless spirit of ambition and disorganizing faction. To the constant and fervent use of these means I would urge myself, I would call my brethren of the clergy and laity. Under the agency of the Divine Spirit, by them, in connexion with the worship and ordinances of the Church, we shall be excited and advanced in the spiritual life, animated and strengthened to the faithful discharge of the duties of the stations in which God, by his providence, has placed us, and finally secure, through the merits of our divine Lord, the great end of our calling, the salvation of our souls."—p. 396—397.

It is gratifying to learn that in this last effort to preserve unity and peace, he was finally entirely successful. The struggle was a little protracted in pamphlets, not free from irritating expressions, accusing the Bishop of acting "on the example of *some civil governments prohibiting more than three from conversing together at the corners of the streets.*" The good sense and feeling of the community were, however, strongly on the side of Hobart:—his authority swayed those who were not convinced by his arguments, and the society shortly dissolved by common consent.

The renewed health and vigour with which this excellent man now continued to discharge his rapidly increasing duties led his friends to hope he would long be spared to their anxious prayers. But on his visitation in the beginning of September, 1830, a short illness at the house of his friend Dr. Rudd, at Auburn, terminated his valuable life.

The little we have attempted to detail can give but a slight impression of the powerful influence exercised by so devoted and ardent a servant of God. It is strikingly drawn forth in Dr. Berrian's volume by many particulars in private life of his judicious counsels and ready assistance to those who sought it; and by his multiplied correspondence as well with this country, as with the zealous churchmen of his own, particularly the upright-minded Ravenscroft, whose loss has been more recently deplored.

One conclusion an impartial review of this eminently public character must enforce on every candid mind. Whatever we hold as a truth of religion, let no supposed expediency induce us to compromise it in the hope of gaining any supposed advantage to religion. Truth can be promoted only by truth; and truth desires no other defence, but that her champions should be faithful in her cause. They are the words of Hobart in his *Apology for Apostolic Order*, which have since become a watchword with the Episcopals of America.

"My banner is **EVANGELICAL TRUTH, APOSTOLIC ORDER**. Firm and undaunted I must summon to my sacred cause whatever powers nature, (alas! as yet too little cultivated by the laborious hand of study) has bestowed upon me; *whatever ardour, whatever zeal* nature has kindled in my bosom. But it were vain to rest here. I must arm myself by imploring the grace of Him whose glory it is *to make often the humblest instrument the victorious champion of truth.*"

It was not without an omen that he wrote these words. The Church in America, which at his succession to the episcopal charge, was so divided and depressed as scarcely to have strength for any public measures, is now daily increasing in stability and strength, and unanimity of principle. The parochial clergy and congregations of the province of New York were twice doubled in number during the episcopate of Hobart; and of six or seven hundred ministers in the American Church, nearly one-third are contained in that province. The Theological Seminary is beginning to supply to the several states of the Union a number of well instructed candidates for the ministerial office. The religious and charitable institutions supported by Episcopals are, in many places, exerting a beneficial influence on the mass of population. The proceedings of the provincial conventions, and the triennial General Convention of the Church, are conducted in a manner which reflect much credit on their de-

liberative wisdom. But the peculiar charm of the American Episcopalian character is, a simple-minded affection for primitive Christianity, a hearty reverence for the beauty of holiness in the church's ordinances, and a freshness of admiration for that sacred Liturgy, which is here so rashly violated by crude propositions of reform.\* In a word, the spirit of Hobart seems to animate their counsels; his wish is believed to have dictated the choice of his successor; and the church which still numbers the Onderdonks, Brownell, and Doane among her Bishops, has no reason to fear for the integrity of her doctrines or the order of her discipline.

It is impossible to rise from the contemplation of such a character as Hobart's without partaking of some of his animating sentiments. Let the hand of violence do its worst, a portion will still remain for the inheritance of truth. Hobart himself beautifully expressed it. "A state of society without religion cannot continue long. Man does not feel himself in safety even with his fellow men, loosened from the restraints of religion. He cannot live without its consolations—he cannot enter on futurity without its hopes."†

What then, it may be said, do we wish to see the Church in England standing on the same footing? Are we willing she should try her success in the same state of destitution? If the iniquity of the times should lead to a profligate spoliation of all that ancient piety has given, we accept the terms. "*The teitree and the oak have their substance in them, when they cast their leaves.*"‡ But let not a rash temerity, even in the best of causes, provoke so grievous an alternative. Do we wish to see the number of her ministers shrink to a proportion like that of the non-jurors, or the present Episcopal clergy in America, six or seven hundred, (less than half the number now included in the diocese of London only,) in a population of twelve millions?§

\* It would be easy to multiply proofs of this assertion from the writings of the American clergy; but we must be content with one only, the cotemporary of Hobart, the gentle-spirited Dehon, who has not been unaptly called the Bishop Horne of America. As it has been the custom to appeal to the American Prayer-book as a precedent for alterations, it is interesting to learn that Dehon, (who being of French parents, could have no prejudice in favour of the English Liturgy,) "regretted these alterations, and wished nothing had been changed, except so far as was made necessary by the change of their civil government." Some one having mentioned to him the commendations of such men as Dr. Adam Clarke and Robert Hall, not members of our communion, "he who praises the Liturgy," said Bishop Dehon, "praises himself; he does but pay a compliment to his own taste and judgment." We extract these notes from Dr. Gadsden's Life of Dehon, published last year at Charleston, p. 112, 123. This and Dr. Berrian's Memoir should be added to every collection of Ecclesiastical Biography.

† Convention Sermon, 1814.

‡ Is. vi. 13.

§ The Universalists alone, a sect who substitute a kind of Protestant purgatory for Hell, have, according to Dr. Empie, a more numerous ministry than the Episcopal Church. It may be feared that many of the Episcopal Clergy are sining out a main-

Do we forget how far the existence even of this body is due to the painful labours of the endowed Church at home? Can we calmly see the people that adhere to her services, perish for lack of knowledge, or be left to the camp-meeting and its nocturnal orgies, where they are now summoned to the decent village-church, and hear "the Angel-music of the Sabbath chime?"\* Shall we console ourselves in such a prospect by imagining that though a smaller, it will be a purer Church? Are then the unestablished sects so pure of all ambition and worldly policy,—or is it not, as in civil communities, that the smallest bodies are agitated by such discords most? The pure form of our church-government may do much; the authority of such men as Hobart may do much;—and such men the Church of England will not seek in vain at her hour of need: but how will their voice be heard, when the Liturgy is hacked in pieces by the broad sword of dragoons, as it was once in England, or more hatefully mangled by scurril parodies, as it was in America by Franklin and his faction? Of this, indeed, we are well assured, that the establishment cannot fall without involving all the worthiest interests of the country in its ruin. Not for our Church, but for our country, do we offer the heartfelt prayer, that we may not see the day when our magistrates shall forget the better half of their commission,—that they may still be endued with grace from above "to execute justice, and to *maintain truth*."

That the more intelligent classes among the Americans themselves are aware of the value of an establishment, we have just reason to conclude; the efforts of all religious men in that country are now directed to secure a better endowment for religion.† That Hobart and his friends should have succeeded so tenance by secular employments, as editors of newspapers, bookseller's agents, &c., not to speak of more entire abstractions from their calling, as instanced in Bishop Chase.

\* "I performed public service on Sunday in the public room at Catawba Springs to a small collection of people, whom a very rainy day deterred from visiting a camp-meeting in the vicinity." Bishop Ravenscroft's Address to Convention, N. Carolina, 1829.

† "Unless the church has other resources than annual contributions, it may be exiled, and with difficulty, if ever, reinstated." Dehon, Life, p. 175. This good man laboured, often too ineffectually, to revive the congregations, which before the Revolution had existed in his province. It was impossible to procure ministers dependent on casual bounty. He attempted to engage lay-readers. "The excitement of the Bishop's visit would last a few months, and then the people or the reader would neglect to attend." p. 185.

Archdeacon Strachan, one of the most valuable of our Church's ministers in Canada, was at New York shortly after the publication of Hobart's famous sermon; and while he was the Bishop's guest, held an animated conversation with him on the question of Establishments. In the midst of the dialogue the door opened, and a man from the Catskill mountains was introduced, who told the Bishop that their Missionary's time had almost expired, and that being few in number they could not engage him for six months longer without aid from the Missionary Fund. Hobart promised the necessary assistance, and on his departure said with a smile, "How unlucky that my country friend should come at such a moment, to show the nakedness of the land!"—Arch-

far with so little aid of this kind, is their high and well-earned praise. But their candour has not permitted them to disguise the character of a government without religion. "Promises of improvement in civil policy, built on the ruins of religious profession in all its forms, and aiming at the rooting out of religious principle;—this design made the ground of extensive action, advocated by splendid talents, committed to the *agency of large associations,—obtaining national adoption, carried into effect by public law;*"\*—expressions such as these may give a slight notion of the hardihood of iniquity, where truth has no public safeguard. Far be it from us to reproach our brethren in America with the evils they deplore; we pray a prosperous issue to the struggle which still awaits both us and them. As plants removed from the parent tree, though no longer nurtured by her roots, are said to partake her vigour or decay; the civil and religious health of our separated colonists must still bear the complexion of our own; and the day on which the hedge of our vineyard is torn down, will shed a disastrous blight on the thriving plantation of the wilderness.

---

ART. IV.—*Christian Ethics; or, Moral Philosophy on the Principles of Divine Revelation.* By Ralph Wardlaw, D.D. London. Jackson and Walford, 1833.

IN an advertisement prefixed to this volume, we are informed that the ministers of the congregational connexion have founded in the metropolis a Library and Lecture, with the view of promoting ecclesiastical, theological, and biblical learning among their professional members. The Lecture is meant to comprehend a series of discourses delivered annually, and resembling in their form academic prelections rather than such popular addresses as might be pronounced in the ears of a common audience. The chief objects contemplated by this Institute are to illustrate the evidence and importance of the great doctrines of Revelation; to exhibit the true principles of philology in their application to such doctrines; to prove the accordance and identity of genuine philosophy with the records and discoveries of Scripture; and to trace to their proper sources the errors and corruptions which have existed in the Christian church. The patrons also express their hope that some of the more wealthy in their body will be found to emulate the zeal which established the Boyle, the Warburton, and the Bampton Lectures in the national church.

deacon Strachan's Letter on the character of Bishop Hobart, to Dr. Chalmers of Edinburgh, p. 48.—New York, 1832.

\* Pastoral Letter of the American Bishops, 1829, p. 7.

The work before us presents the first fruits of this tree of knowledge, submitted to the taste of the public, under the auspices of the committee who superintended its planting and pruning. We are aware, however, that the responsibility as to doctrine and talent does not rest with the learned persons who have undertaken to usher the several treatises into the world, but with the individual authors whose names appear in their respective title-pages. In examining the argument, therefore, of Dr. Wardlaw's volume, we shall confine our remarks to it, as if it were a distinct publication; proceeding from a pen which is certainly not unknown to the theological reader, and occupied with a subject which possesses a deep and general interest.

In taking up his ground, the lecturer shows a becoming solicitude to define the respective provinces of philosophy and revelation, and to claim for the latter the authority which unquestionably belongs to it. Alluding to the spirit which, he assures us, sometimes prevails in the academical institutions of the north, he hints that there is occasionally to be found among the philosophers of his native land, a species of respect for the Scriptures which is perhaps more injurious in its tendencies, especially to the youthful mind, than a direct and open denial of their inspiration. While spoken of with verbal courtesy and all due deference, they are still subjected to the reasonings of men; and, at times, by a miserable perversion of their words, the inspired penmen are even represented as subjecting themselves to such reasonings, recommending their doctrines to the revision of human wisdom, and by no means demanding implicit submission. "I speak as to wise men, judge ye what I say," is insidiously interpreted as a disclaimer of ultimate authority, and as leaving every thing which the writer dictates to be received or not, according as it does or does not coincide with the reader's own judgment. Insinuations are thrown out, that in none of our investigations should we allow our minds to be trammelled by prepossessions, and restrained from that freedom of inquiry which is every man's inalienable birthright, and of which the due appreciation and the fearless use are the peculiar glory of philosophy. Hints are suggested that in our interpretations of Scripture we may possibly be mistaken; and that, notwithstanding the obscurity which prevails in many parts of the book, there may be some principle of harmony between what it testifies, or seems to testify, and the decisions of philosophy: but, at all events, that it is the part of an ingenuous mind to follow the conclusions to which sound and unprejudiced reason conducts it. Philosophy in this way, it is remarked, still keeps the precedence; and the apostles and prophets are, with all politeness, and every assurance of the most profound respect,



bowed to the door. Dr. Wardlaw observes, that it would be more honest and less pernicious, were they unceremoniously hooted off the stage, than thus dismissed with the simulation of courtesy. The assurances of respect serve no other purpose than to lessen the shock given to the principles and feelings of those who have previously been accustomed to defer to their authority. The sacred writers are found to stand inconveniently in the way. It would be rude to beard them, and to set them at open defiance. "The happy art," says he, "is to slip the pupil gently and cautiously past them without any appearance of assault or contumely, and so as that he himself shall hardly be aware of the passage that has been made for him."

"I may be allowed here to observe how deeply it is to be deplored that the philosophy which issues from certain chairs of our schools of learning should be thus in its spirit and in many of its principles, unbaptized and covertly antichristian. I mention it the rather for the sake of impressing on parents and guardians of youth, the vast importance to a young man, previously to his attendance on a course of such prelections, of his being thoroughly established in the enlightened conviction of the paramount authority of revelation; so that he does not hold this conviction as the mere result of educational prejudice, but as the effect of an extensive and intelligent acquaintance as possible with its contents, and with the harmonious dependencies of all the parts of its system of truth, of a careful study of its evidences, and, above all, of a heartfelt experience of its renewing power. If he comes under such tuition as I have been describing, with nothing in his mind in behalf of the bible, beyond a youthful prepossession, he runs an imminent risk. His mind will soon be bewildered. At the first suggestion of any speculation, which seems at variance with what he has been accustomed to revere as the testimony of God, his heart may beat thick with a distressful trepidation. But he gets over the first agitation. He becomes by degrees enamoured of the theories that are brought before him. The views are novel; the arguments in their support are unanticipated and plausible. The opinions and speculations are pleasing and captivating to the ardour of youthful fancy, and alluring to the spirit of inquisitive curiosity and independent thinking. Doubts arise and multiply. A spirit of speculative scepticism is generated, and gradually gains the ascendant. Early notions and impressions are discarded as unfounded prejudices; and the Bible is either thrown aside as a volume of 'old wives' fables,' or 'a heterogeneous compound of philosophical and theological opinions, ill-assorted, and mutually contradictory.'—I may be thought to have drawn this picture strongly: yet I am not aware of having, in any of its shades, overlaid the colouring, or of having delineated any one of its features in caricature. It is more than my fear, it is my conviction and my knowledge, that with little if any softening, the portrait has had its prototype in fact."

Although these lectures on Christian ethics were delivered in



London, we must presume that the severe reproaches pointed by Dr. Wardlaw against the usual method of teaching moral philosophy, do not apply to any of the great seminaries in which the clergy of our church receive their professional education. We are confirmed in this opinion by a reference to Dr. Chalmers, who, in his Bridgewater treatise, makes a number of strictures, similar in their spirit and intention, on the system of ethical instruction pursued in the northern section of the kingdom. He observes "that the great error of this academic theism, as commonly treated, is, that it expresses no want; that it reposes on its own fancied sufficiency; and that all its landing-places are within itself, and along the uttermost limits of its own territory. It is no reproach, he admits, against our philosophical moralists that they have not stepped beyond the threshold of that peculium which is strictly and appropriately their's, or not made incursion into another department besides their own. The legitimate complaint is that, on taking leave of their disciples, they warn them not of their being only yet in the outset or the prosecution of a journey, instead of having reached the termination of it. They, in fact, take leave of them in the middle of an unprotected highway, when they should have raised a finger-post of direction to the places that lie beyond. Along the confines of its domain, there should be raised in every quarter the floating signals of distress, that its scholars, instead of being lulled into the imagination that now they may repose as in so many secure and splendid dwelling-places, should be taught to regard them only as towers of observation, whence they have to look for their ulterior guidance and their ulterior supplies to the regions of a conterminous theology."\*

To adopt the sentiments of the same distinguished author, we may say of moral philosophy, even in its most finished state, that it is not what may be called a terminating science. It is at best but a science *in transitu*, and its lessons are those of a preparatory school. It contains but the rudiments of a noble acquirement, and he discharges best the functions of a teacher, not who satiates but who excites the appetite, and then leaves it wholly unappeased. This arises from the real state and bearing of the science, as being a science not so much of doctrines as of desiderata. At most, it leaves its scholars in a sort of twilight obscurity; and if a just account is rendered of the subject, there will unavoidably be the feeling, that, instead of having reached a secure landing-place, we have broken off as in the middle of an unfinished demonstration.†

Considering duly the import of such statements, we cannot allow ourselves to doubt that the plan of studying moral philo-

\* Vol. II. p. 298.

† P. 301.

sophy, in certain parts of the empire, stands in need of reform; and, moreover, that science, in general, is not in those districts sufficiently imbued with Christian principle to render it a suitable introduction to the loftier investigations of theology. We make no assertion as to the fact itself, and far less in regard to the places or persons whom the learned doctors, Chalmers and Wardlaw, appear to have in their eye, while they dilate on the errors and defects of their national ethics. The feeling on our part cannot amount to any thing more than an impression that the profound speculations of the Scottish metaphysicians are not always regulated by a becoming respect for revealed truth; that they push on towards their conclusions with more courage than godly reverence; and that they hold their tenets not less resolutely, though they are found to interfere with the dictates of inspiration.\*

Let it be noted, however, that so far as practical ethics, or the rule of life, are considered, there is no discrepancy among writers of eminence, whether in the north or in the south, and no deviation from the standard established in holy writ. The only difference of opinion that ever appears among them, respects the *grounds* and *reasons* of virtue; the *qualities* which constitute good, as viewed through the medium of system, and the source of the *obligation* to pursue it under which mankind, in their present state, find themselves placed.

To those who are not familiar with the speculations of philosophy on these heads, it may seem strange that numerous hypotheses should have been devised by ingenious men, in order to discover *what it is* in a virtuous action which gains our approbation, and what is the *principle* in our nature which pronounces the approval. The two points now stated comprehend all the inquiries that can be directed into the arcana of ethical science; namely, the *matter* of virtue or moral good, and the *faculty*, whether allied to intellect or mere sentiment, which appreciates its quality, and determines its amount. To the considerations suggested by these two questions may be reduced all the theories on human action, which have been entertained from the days of Plato and Aristotle down to those of Godwin and Brown.

But, before we can proceed to give an outline of the various systems which Dr. Wardlaw has subjected to examination, it is necessary to remove a bar which he has raised to the validity of all conclusions formed by the natural reason of man. He maintains that owing to the corruption wherewith, in consequence of the fall, our nature is infected, the human being, in the first place, no longer presents a fair specimen of our race, upon which to exercise either observation or experiment; and, secondly, that his

\* Sir J. Mackintosh mentions the "antipathy of George III. to Scotch metaphysics."

intellectual powers are so much blunted and impaired that no reliance can be placed on their decision, even when they are honestly employed. Man, he reminds us, is in our present enquiry, both the *investigator*, and in part, at least, the *subject of investigation*; and that in each of these views of him there is a source of error. The first arises from the influence of depravity on his character in the former of these capacities; and the second springs from his disposition to make his own nature, fallen and debased as it is, the standard of moral principle. To use his own words;

“The mental powers of men are injuriously affected on every point that relates to religion and virtue by his moral alienation from God, the eternal prototype of all excellence. They are prone to aberration. His moral perceptions have lost their original clearness. A corrupt tendency has been infused into all his speculations and reasonings; so that on the topics referred to, his conclusions are not, without great caution, to be depended upon. How preposterous would it be to commit the decision of an inquiry respecting the true principles of *moral rectitude* to a creature subject to all the blinding and perverting influences of the principles of *moral pravity*!”—“It must be obvious to every reflecting mind that while the degrees in which depravity operates may be various, yet on topics such as that we are now discussing, there can be no certainty in the conclusions to which we may come. His is a cause in which the judge is prepossessed, and his decisions are not to be trusted.”

Thus, not only are his faculties biased and enfeebled, and, consequently, unequal to the task of an impartial and vigorous investigation: his nature itself is likewise so deteriorated as no longer to furnish him with a fair subject of study. Nothing but error and confusion can be the result of an attempt to discover the principles of morality from the workings of a constitution so deeply corrupted; to extract a pure system of ethics from the elements of depravity; to found the superstructure of moral science on the scattered and unstable rubbish of fallen humanity!

The author endeavours still further to illustrate his meaning on this head by the following comparison. Suppose a chemist were desirous to ascertain the ingredients of water. What estimate, says he, should we form of his judgment, if, with this view, he were to subject to analysis a quantity of what had just passed in the bed of a sluggish river, through the midst of a large manufacturing city, from the common sewers of which and other outlets of impurity it had received every possible contamination; and if, proceeding on such analysis, he were to publish to the world a treatise on the composition of that fluid? Human nature in its present state, is the water of the polluted river; and those philosophers, it is maintained, who seek to derive from the study of it correct ideas of moral rectitude, are not wiser than the sup-

posed chemist who takes his specimen from a puddle instead of a clear fountain.

Dr. Wardlaw, whose strong language on human depravity we are not now disposed to question, has, it is very obvious, led himself and his reader into much unnecessary perplexity, by confounding those views of morality which respect the practical conduct of life, with the more recondite disquisitions on ethics, regarded as a science, of which the object is to determine the abstract qualities, so to speak, of good and evil, in connection with certain feelings and judgments of the human mind. It is readily granted that nothing could be more futile or absurd than to attempt to elevate a standard of right and wrong on the behaviour of the wisest and most virtuous of the sons of men; while it is equally manifest that nothing could be more dangerous than to rely on such a standard, either when estimating our doings towards others, or measuring their effect on our own characters and destination.

Assuredly, so far as his practice is taken into account, man has ceased to be a law unto himself as well as to those around him. Were human action, associated, as it always ought to be, with the motives whence it springs, subjected to the analysing process of a chemist, whose tests and solvents could be applied to mind, it is probable that, in most cases, it would appear not less polluted than the water of the sluggish river passing through the midst of a great manufacturing city. Again, as to the judgment which a man pronounces upon his own conduct where there is any ground for doubt, it must be at once acknowledged, that no decision could be more fallacious. The judge is prepossessed, and his opinion must go for nothing. In this case, the depravity and imperfection which adhere to our nature, preclude the possibility of deriving from it a standard of moral rectitude as applicable to practice.

But, we repeat, it is not upon such considerations that ethical systems are founded. The criterion of which the philosopher goes in search has no immediate reference to the dealings of mankind with one another, nor to the equity, the expediency, or the generosity of any particular action viewed in relation to individual character. The speculative moralist, in seeking a standard of virtue, has an object quite different from that of the magistrate or the divine, who, in giving their judgments or their exhortations, have their thoughts fixed on the law of the land or on the revealed will of heaven. On the contrary, it is the purpose of his investigation to discover the grounds on which the legislation of virtue and vice has its original basis; to detect the reasons which influenced the mind of the lawgiver when he enjoined one class of actions and prohibited another; and thereby to ascertain what are

the intrinsic qualities or tendencies in the former class which secure for them the approbation of every unsophisticated heart.

Failing to perceive or to follow out the distinction now mentioned Dr. Wardlaw recurs throughout his whole book to the argument already stated; namely, that as man is depraved in his inclinations and weakened in his intellectual powers, he is no longer capable either of supplying a model of excellence, or of appreciating the beauty of virtue, were it presented to his observation. It must be manifest, we think, to every one who has read Hobbes, Bishop Butler, Hutcheson, Hume, Smith, Price, Hartley, Paley and Dr. Brown, that the particular property in human action which it is the object of ethical science to investigate, is as abstract and intellectual as is gravity in the contemplation of an astronomer, or the principle of affinity in the researches of a chemist. Hence it follows that the success and authority of the moral philosopher do not depend on the purity of his feelings or on the integrity of his life. In pursuing the intricacies of system, the subtle mind of Hobbes, and the ingenious reasoning of Hume, are not less worthy of confidence than the penetration of the pious Butler, and the sound logic of the sagacious Paley. The writings of Plato, Epicurus, Zeno, Cicero, Bishop Berkeley, and Dugald Stewart, are placed on the same footing, so far as they treat of those ethical doctrines which respect the *καλον*, the *pulchrum* and the *honestum*,—in other words, the origin of virtue, and the source of moral approbation.

It will be admitted, too, we are persuaded, upon suitable reflection, that human nature in its present state is the proper subject of ethical investigation; because it is only as connected with its actual feelings, propensities and wants, that it can be viewed as the basis of a consistent theory of morals. This will appear in a still clearer light when we consider that the relations, the sympathies and desires of such creatures as our first parents were in Paradise, could not afford any ground on which to rest the moral judgments, the blame or approbation, of the race at large, in circumstances so completely different. The hypotheses of philosophical inquirers, it is well known, bear a direct reference to the mixed passions of man, in the imperfect condition in which he now appears, and to the effect of certain actions and sentiments on the general happiness of society, composed as it is of such various ingredients.

Were we, indeed, in search of the most perfect model of obedience, gratitude, and all other human excellence, or even of a practical rule, suited to a being whose mental qualities had not yet been tainted with evil nor enfeebled by corruption, we should most certainly endeavour to make ourselves acquainted with the

habits of feeling and acting which adorned the intercourse of man before sin entered into the world. But, as things now are, such an attempt would be equally difficult and useless. The materials with which the sacred volume supplies us, are much too scanty to enable the most ingenious theorist to construct a system of paradisaical ethics; and it is obvious that were he to succeed in tracing the motives or sentiments, which, in the breasts of our first ancestors, produced an entire compliance with the divine will, we should not thereby obtain a more satisfactory view of those profound doctrines which it is the object of the moral philosopher to establish.

The studies of the geologist, the chemist, and the botanist might be met with an objection similar to that started by Dr. Wardlaw against the researches of the speculative moralist. The terraqueous globe, it may be said, is no longer what it was when it proceeded from the hand of the great Creator. It bears upon it the mark of a curse. The surface is torn and shattered, and the strata which compose its inward parts are dislocated, bent, and, in many instances, removed from their original position. To obtain a true theory of the earth, therefore, we ought, it might be asserted, to ascend to the era of its primitive order and beauty; for at present we contemplate only the ruins of a magnificent system, from the study of which we can barely conjecture what it must have been before it was subjected to that violence of which it everywhere exhibits the marks. In like manner the botanist might be told that his modern arrangements can give no idea of the genera and species of the fair vegetation which bloomed in the garden of Eden, when as yet thorns and thistles were not permitted to mingle their deformities with the green herbs and pleasant plants, from which the innocent inhabitants were to derive their food. On the same ground it might be maintained, that no water subjected to analysis in these days can equal, in point of purity, the crystal streams which gladdened the abode of Adam and Eve before rain had fallen upon the earth, and when the rich produce of the soil was only moistened by the dews of heaven.

To such observations we would reply, in the spirit of our remarks on Dr. Wardlaw, that it is not the structure of the newly-formed globe with which we are desirous to become acquainted; nor are the flowers which adorned its surface the object of our research; neither is it the chemical property of any pristine substance that we long to ascertain. Our study is directed to the constitution and furniture of the earth as it now presents itself to our notice; being satisfied that the knowledge which may be thereby acquired will prove of much more practical value than the most accurate description of things which have long passed away.



We are perfectly aware, at the same time, that water, like virtue, is seldom found pure. There is no spring nor river which is not impregnated with saline and earthly bodies of different kinds. The most limpid fountain contains carbonate of lime, muriate of lime or muriate of soda, mixed with a little alkali—substances which are also detected in the most salubrious currents that descend from our hills. But we are of opinion, notwithstanding, that more advantage may be derived to science, as well as to the common uses of life, from the knowledge of water as it actually exists, than from the assurance, if any such could be obtained, that, before the fall, this liquid comprehended no ingredient besides oxygen and hydrogen.

If the question were in regard to the most orderly stratification of rocks that could possibly be imagined, or the most brilliant flowers, or the purest water, we might at once refer to the condition of things which immediately succeeded the days of creation, when the face of nature presented no object that was not very good. But if, on the other hand, the question really respects those physical causes which, since that epoch, have been employed in changing the form and fixing the relations of the various substances which compose the crust of the earth, or in perpetuating the several generations of the vegetable kingdom, our theories must be confined to the phenomena which meet our observation in the present less perfect aspect of the material world.

Let it be remembered, too, that it is only in a very modified sense that man can be said to have been the subject of a moral law before he became a sinner. The test of his obedience in Eden was positive, not ethical in the proper meaning of the word; his position being such that the requisitions of the Decalogue were, generally speaking, quite inapplicable to him as the rule of his conduct. Hence no "standard of rectitude," even in the practical acceptation, which alone seems to have occupied the mind of our author, could have been constructed from the fullest view of the primeval state of the human being.

But we repeat once more, that it is not a practical standard of rectitude of which the moral philosopher is in quest; on the contrary; he labours to fix the ideas of mankind as to the particular quality in an action or sentiment which attracts their approbation and complacency, as well as in regard to the mental faculty whose office it is to determine the limits of virtue, to define the proper boundaries of praise and blame.

It has been observed as not a little remarkable, that though all men agree that there are acts which ought to be done, and acts which ought not to be done; though the far greater part of mankind agree in their list of virtues and duties, of vices and crimes; yet



there are no questions in the circle of inquiry to which answers more various have been given than—How men have thus come to agree in the rule of life; Whence arises their general reverence for it; and What is meant by affirming that it ought to be inviolably observed? It is singular, that when we are most nearly agreed respecting rules, we should differ so much as to the *causes* of our agreement, and as to the *reasons* which justify us in adhering to it. The discussion of these subjects is what is called the *Theory of Morals*, in a sense not in all respects coincident with what is usually considered theory in other sciences. When we investigate the *causes* of our moral agreement, the term theory retains its ordinary scientific sense; but when we endeavour to ascertain the *reasons* of it, we rather employ the term as importing the rules of an art. In the first case, theory denotes, as elsewhere, the most general laws to which certain facts can be reduced; whereas, in the second, it points out the efficacy of certain rules, when observed in practice, for producing the intended effects.

It must have already become apparent that in these inquiries are involved two separate subjects; first, the distinction between right and wrong in human conduct; and, secondly, the nature of those feelings with which right and wrong are contemplated by human beings. The former leads to an investigation into the *criterion of morality* viewed in reference to action; while the latter constitutes what has been called the *theory of moral sentiments*. Other most important questions arise in this province. But the two problems which have just been stated, and the essential distinctions between them, must be clearly apprehended by all who are desirous of understanding the controversies which have prevailed on ethical subjects. This discrimination, it is remarked, however, has seldom been made by moral philosophers; the difference between the two problems has not been uniformly observed by any of them; and they have been, not rarely, confounded by very eminent men, to the destruction of all just conception, and of all correct reasoning, in this most important, and perhaps most difficult of sciences.\*

That Dr. Wardlaw holds a place among those who have not formed a correct notion of the objects contemplated by the moral philosopher, will appear manifest to every one who reads his book with attention. He quotes a passage from an author who says, "that we discover the office or use of any work, whether natural or artificial, by observing its structure, the parts of which it consists, and their connection or joint action. It is thus we understand the office or use of a watch, a plant, an eye, or a hand. It

\* Sir James M'Entosh's Dissertation, p. 297.

is the same with a living creature of the rational and also of the brute kind. Therefore to determine the office, duty or distinction of man, we must inspect his constitution, take every part to pieces, examine their mutual relations one to the other, and the common effect or tendency of the whole."

In reply to these sensible observations, Dr. Wardlaw remarks, that,

"according to this statement, we are to pursue our investigations in morals as we do our researches in physics, regarding the present moral constitution of man, indicated by its various phenomena, as being in all respects the work of Deity, as really as the structure of his corporeal frame, or that of any creature, animate or inanimate, in the physical world; so that from the observation of man as he is, we are to learn the moral character of Deity, and the principles of rectitude as existing in his nature and approved under his government, in the same way in which we discover his intelligence and wisdom from the marks of skill in the material universe. This, of course, proceeds on the assumption, that man, as he now is, is what he was originally made, and was designed by his Maker to continue to be."

This stricture on an anonymous writer is not less deficient in candour than in philosophical accuracy. It violates the former, inasmuch as it neglects the distinction made by the author, to whom it refers, that "moral philosophy inquires, not how man might have been, but how he is constituted; not into what principles his actions may be artfully resolved, but from what principles and dispositions they actually flow." It is equally unjust to conclude that those who regard the actual condition of man as the proper subject of ethical examination, believe that from such study we are to learn the moral character of the Deity, and the principles of rectitude approved under his government. Such an insinuation is hardly less insidious than if a sceptic were to assert, that from exploring the ravages of a volcano, or noting the fierce temper of the tiger or the bear, we should find an indication of the feelings which actuate the Divine Mind in the arrangements of providence. It would be absurd to inquire, whether, if sin had not entered into the world, any volcanic eruption would have taken place, or whether the wild beast would have exhibited the mild disposition which distinguishes the lamb and the turtle-dove. Our business in the several fields of geology, of animal nature, and of moral science, is to mark the properties of things as they actually present themselves, without presuming to decide whether they are what God meant them to be, or otherwise.

We observe another instance of this uncandid interpretation as applied to an expression used by the late Dr. Brown. This ingenious writer remarks that, "since the world was created, there

have indeed been myriads of human beings on the earth; but there has been only one God, and there is only one God. There is, therefore, only one voice of moral approbation among mankind; because He, the great approver and the great former of our constitution, is one." Whatever may be thought of the theory on which this observation is founded, there is certainly no impiety in the opinion that the approval of virtue by all the tribes of mankind is equivalent to the voice of the Almighty speaking in his intellectual creatures. But Dr. Wardlaw, whose mind appears cramped by his narrow views, pronounces that it contains, "in few words, the essence of the vitiating error of so many philosophical systems—that our moral constitution as it now appears was *formed* and is *approved* by the Divine Being." Now it is manifest that Dr. Brown does not say that God approves our moral constitution as it now appears; but merely that, as the "great approver" of virtue, He has given to the human race one voice of moral approbation. The insertion of a comma brings out the meaning of the philosopher, which it is somewhat surprising that any one could have mistaken.

That we have not misrepresented the doctrines which distinguish this treatise on Christian Ethics, will be rendered obvious by a quotation from that section of it which professes to analyse the opinions of the principal writers on the metaphysics of morality.

It is well known that Dr. Hutcheson of Glasgow, imagining that a certain analogy subsists between the impressions made on the external senses by their proper objects, whether of sight, smell or sound, and those sentiments in the inner man which respect matters of right and wrong, gave to conscience the name of the moral sense; a phrase which quickly became popular, and continues to be a part of philosophical language. By *sense*, we are told, he understood a capacity of receiving ideas, together with pleasures and pains, from a certain class of objects. The term *moral* was used to describe the particular class in question. It implied only that conscience was a separate element in our nature, and that it was not a state or act of the understanding. According to him it also implied that it was an original and implanted principle, though every other part of his theory might be embraced by those who hold that power or faculty to be derivative.

The remarks of our author on this scheme of moral decision run as follows:

"Were we to understand terms figuratively, we might, in the way of analogy, without any great impropriety, have applied the designation *moral sense*, intelligibly enough, to that intuitive discernment of moral distinctions which we conceive to be the appropriate possession of a sinless creature, and along with the perfect conformity of disposition to the

perception of right, to constitute the harmony of that creature's nature to the nature of Deity. But man is not now such a creature. He is the very reverse—not sinless but radically sinful. And here, therefore, as before, applies our fatal objection. What are we to think of finding the principle, or even the standard and criterion of virtue, in the moral sense of a creature whose moral sense is vitiated and alienated from God? Might we not quite as reasonably nominate as judge of colours a man with jaundiced or otherwise distempered eyes—or a man whose palate, in consequence of some organic or constitutional disorder, had lost its discriminating functions, an arbitrator of tastes? If there be in man's moral vision an obscuring film or a distorting obliquity; if there be a hebetude in his spiritual taste, or such an inversion of its original relishes as to put bitter for sweet or sweet for bitter; must not this equally disqualify him for being a judge of appeal on questions regarding the principles of rectitude? Give the power of which we have been speaking what name you will, a change of name alters not the nature of the thing. It is still the power of a depraved creature, and partaking in the depravity, cannot be safely trusted as a moral arbiter; we never can repose with any thing approaching to implicit confidence in the correctness of its arbitraments. Call it conscience, you are no nearer the truth; for either by conscience you mean the same thing that Dr. Hutcheson meant by his moral sense, in which case there is no difference at all; or if you mean something else or something more, still it is the conscience of a depraved creature, and being necessarily affected by the depravity, cannot, on such a subject, be a secure standard of principle. We can no more confide in the certain rectitude of its decisions, than in any case of importance we could with propriety rest a final sentence on the testimony of a witness who was liable to be suborned and bribed, or whom, on different occasions, we knew to have betrayed no very scrupulous regard to truth.—The inward monitor is environed by a fearful assemblage of biasing and vitiating influences, assailing, tempting, bribing it on every hand, whispering their insinuations, alarming by their threats, and alluring by their promises. We should no more, therefore, think of taking our standard of duty from the conscience of such a creature, than we should think of receiving from him our instructions as to the nature of God. If it be true that from the very denomination of depraved affections and desires, men 'did not like to retain *God* in their knowledge,' we surely cannot wonder that they should have discovered an aversion, not less inveterate, to retain the right knowledge of his *will*; especially when we consider that it was in fact the dislike of his will, and the fondness for what was opposite to it, that fostered the spirit of alienation from himself, and engendered the wish for gods more congenial to their depraved propensities."

We have here a striking illustration of the remark with which we set out, that Dr. Wardlaw confounds a standard of practical morality with those problems in ethics which respect the causes and reasons of moral approbation, viewed in the light of science. It is true that the jaundiced eye could not judge well of colours in

any particular case, no more than the opinion of a very bad man could be relied on in any special occurrence where his own passions were concerned. But in regard to the general laws of light on which the principles of optics depend, and by a reference to which the effects of reflection and refraction are determined, a blind man might discourse most learnedly. So is it with respect to the decisions of the palate. We admit that, were the "discriminating functions" lost or greatly impaired by disease, we could not trust to the most accomplished epicure as to the seasoning of any given dish, though it is manifest that the same person might write an able work on gastronomy, setting forth excellent rules for the cook, and explaining the scientific grounds why certain mixtures would produce certain results on the nerves of a healthy gullet. In short, as a man who has never enjoyed the blessing of sight may discuss in a satisfactory manner the origin and relation of colours; and as an individual, whose sensibility to flavour has become dead or depraved, may nevertheless be a master in the doctrine of relishes; so many an author produces a good work on the philosophy of ethics, though his conduct and affections be most alien to virtue. In none of these cases is a standard to be taken from what the persons in question do or feel, but from the conclusions to which they are carried by logical reasoning and legitimate inference. Hence, in reviewing the systems of Zeno, Hobbes, Hume, Hazlit or Bentham, we give ourselves no trouble to discover whether the lives of these writers were in all respects conformable to just rules; retaining in mind the obvious distinction between a theory of morals proposed to the consideration of the schools, and a set of precepts meant for regulating the discharge of the relative duties.

The author is led by his hypothesis to inflict on the moral system of Bishop Butler a degree of critical injustice which a more correct view of ethical science would unquestionably have prevented. The learned prelate remarks, that there are two ways in which the subject of morals may be treated. One begins from inquiring into the abstract relations of the things; the other from a matter of fact, namely, what the particular nature of man is, its several parts, their economy and constitution; from which it proceeds to determine what course of life it is that is correspondent to this whole nature. In the former method, says he, the conclusion is expressed thus, that vice is contrary to the nature and reason of things; in the latter, that it is a violation or breaking in upon our own nature. Thus they both lead us to the same thing, our obligations to the practice of virtue; and thus they exceedingly strengthen and enforce each other. The bishop, in short, takes such a view of the nature of man as to

warrant the statement "that virtue consists in following, and vice in deviating from it." But this inference applies to man's nature considered as a *whole*, and with a respect to the working of all its parts. He illustrates this distinction by alluding to a watch, of which no one can form any conception, unless he see all the wheels, pulleys and springs put together according to the principles which regulate the structure and accomplish the object of that instrument. If all the parts co-operate, it will show the hour of the day. Thus it is, he adds, with regard to the inward frame of man. Appetites, passions, affections, and the principle of reflection, considered merely as the several *parts* of our inward nature, do not at all give us an idea of the *system* or *constitution* of this nature; because the constitution is formed by somewhat not yet taken into consideration, namely, by the relation which these several parts have to each other; the chief of which is the authority of reflection or conscience. It is from considering the relation which the several appetites and passions in the inward frame have to each other, and above all the supremacy of conscience, that we get the idea of the system of human nature. And from the idea itself, says he, "it will as fully appear that this our nature, or constitution, is adapted to virtue, as from the idea of a watch it appears that its nature, that is, constitution or system, is adapted to measure time." "Every bias, instinct or propension within, is a real part of our nature, but not the whole; add to these the superior faculty, whose office it is to adjust, manage, and preside over them, and take in this its natural superiority, and you complete the idea of human nature. And as in civil government, the constitution is broken in upon and violated by power and strength prevailing over authority; so the constitution of man is broken in upon, by the lower faculties or principles within prevailing over that which is in its nature supreme over them all."

Agreeably to the principles now stated, the bishop maintains that we approve or disapprove of actions, not because of their tendency to happiness or the contrary, but in consequence of the moral constitution of our nature; which constitution, as God is its author, we are to regard as furnishing the expression of his will. "He who has formed us in his own image, has not rendered it necessary for us to observe relations, and to estimate tendencies and effects, previously to our approving of an action as right or our disapproving of it as wrong." Being conscious that we love virtue and hate vice without reference to consequences, merely because they are virtue and vice, we justly infer, he concludes, that it is not on account of their consequences that virtue is



lovely and vice hateful, that the one produces the emotions of approbation and the other of disapprobation.

Hence man, according to Bishop Butler, is to be regarded as a law unto himself, and as having "the rule of right within." Your obligation, says he, to obey the law of virtue, is its being the law of your nature. That your conscience approves of, and attests to such a course of action, is itself alone an obligation. He refers, at the same time, to the authority of the apostle Paul, who observes that "when the gentiles, who have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves; who show the works of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another."

Without entering minutely into the origin and authority of conscience, considered as the principle of moral approbation in the human breast, and the arbiter of virtue and vice, we are inclined to agree in the conclusions of the Bishop, if taken in strict connection with the premises whence they are drawn. There is among human beings so great a uniformity in their decisions on right and wrong, as to be quite inexplicable unless we refer it either to an innate feeling which is common to the whole race, or to something in their outward circumstances which applies to all conditions of society. No tribe is so rude as to be without a faint perception of the difference between good and bad. There is no subject on which men of all ages and nations coincide in so many points as in those qualities of conduct and character which deserve esteem. Even the grossest deviations from the general consent will appear, on close examination, to be not so much corruptions of moral feeling, as ignorance of facts, or errors with respect to the consequences of action. It is true that all virtues are not equally esteemed in all parts of the world; and moreover that certain actions of a very doubtful nature are in various lands regarded either as innocent or as positively praiseworthy. Some savages for example expose their infants, and others abandon their aged parents to inevitable death. But if the question be considered on general grounds, it will be admitted that the exceptions, from the agreement of mankind in their notions of morality, sink into absolute insignificance; and we shall learn to view them as no more affecting the harmony of our moral faculties, than the resemblance of the limbs and features is disturbed by monstrous conformations, or by the effects of accident and disease in a few individuals.\*

To the reasoning of the able author of the *Analogy*, Dr. Ward-

\* M'Intosh's *Dissertation*, p. 297.



law has his specific reply in readiness—"if human nature be in a state of depravity, conscience must partake of that depravity."—"Virtue, according to him," says he, "consists in *following nature*, but then the nature to be followed is not the nature of man as it now is; or if it be, then the corruption entertained by the theorist of the depravity of man as a fallen creature, must have been far short of the scriptural representation of it." In allusion to the simile of the watch used by the Bishop, we are assured that the whole machine is out of order. By the "perverse interference of some lover of mischief," as Dr. Wardlaw expresses it, the chronometer has been so thoroughly disorganised; its moving parts and powers so changed in their collocation and mutual action, that the result has become a constant tendency to go backward instead of forward, or to go backwards and forwards with irregular fitful alternation. The main spring has been broken; and an antagonist power works all the parts of the mechanism. The machine, in short, is not only "apt to go out of order," as Bishop Butler described it; but it is out of order; "so radically disorganised, that the grand original power which impelled all its movements has been broken and lost, and an unnatural power, the very opposite of it, has taken its place."

In defence of the learned and most profound reasoner, against whose opinions these rather flippant observations are directed, we have only to recur to the remark already repeated oftener than once—that the author of *Christian Ethics* has constantly confounded the theoretical notion with the practical rule. Bishop Butler does not assert that the law of virtue can be ascertained from the actual conduct of any class of men even the most enlightened and most reasonable; but merely that it may be derived from a philosophical examination of the mental fabric of the human being, whose welfare is obviously connected with temperance, justice, benevolence and truth. From inspecting the course of events in this lower world, it is manifest that happiness springs from the exercise of those sentiments which are usually denominated virtuous; and also that as soon as we remove beyond the bounds of their influence, we deviate into the path of sorrow, shame, and the most poignant suffering. In this respect, therefore, the nature of man is evidently "adapted to virtue." His greatness, his felicity, and his usefulness are inseparably connected with controul over his own passions, and with a tender feeling for the interests of others. This conclusion, too, applies to the present condition of mankind, sinful and imperfect as it unquestionably is, as forcibly as it could have applied in the state of innocence; for in either case, exemption from pain is suspended upon obedience to the law of God, whether written, as St. Paul

says, in the heart, or pronounced in the ear from the mounts of the law and the gospel. The sentiments of the whole human race, as we have already suggested, are also in harmony with this law of virtue; for however widely the children of Adam may depart from temperance and forbearance, their consciences most assuredly are ever ready to accuse at least their more flagrant crimes and delinquencies.

On other grounds, we might perhaps see reason to differ with the Bishop as to the view which he takes of the nature and authority of conscience, regarded as the principle which determines the distinction between right and wrong in human conduct. The same objections might be urged against his doctrine which have been raised to the theory of Dr. Hutcheson, as founded on the assumption of a moral sense in man. But so far as either hypothesis proceeds on the actual condition of mankind, we cannot entertain any opposition: because there is no other basis on which the ethical philosopher can rear a scientific structure. If "man be the proper study of man," it must be man as he really exists; displaying his powers, passions, and propensities in connection with the various demands of society, and even with the qualities of the material world which influence so deeply his character and destination.

With man in any other imaginable condition different from that in which we now find him, we have no concern. Place him in other circumstances and under an opposite character, and our knowledge immediately gives way to conjecture. Dr. Wardlaw himself asks what was conscience in a sinless creature? In other words, what was conscience in man while in his state of innocence? There was then, he admits, a perfect identity between his judgment of rectitude and God's; and an identity equally perfect between his disposition towards it, and God's. Suppose, says he, we were to affirm the existence of *conscience*, what should we express by it? What would be the province of the new faculty? We have already an enlightened understanding and a pure heart; perfect knowledge and perfect love; a right judgment and a right disposition. Conscience, he elsewhere adds, is a term which in its customary use belongs rather to the vocabulary of man's fallen than of his unfallen nature.

It follows, therefore, from these statements made by the author himself, when free from the influence of preconceived opinion, that the mind of man before the fall was not a proper subject of ethical analysis, because it then presented nothing more than a succession of impressions, all in harmony with the divine law, and experienced too in total ignorance of good and evil as opposed to each other. Before sin entered there could be no

disquisitions on virtue; no reasoning as to the qualities in which it consists, or in respect to the faculty by which these are determined.

We have much satisfaction in expressing our concurrence in Dr. Wardlaw's notions in regard to conscience, viewed as an exercise of the judgment on our own actions, and as thereby differing from the moral sense of Hutcheson, and the original emotions of Dr. Brown :

" I have often," says he, " when thinking on this subject been at a loss to conceive what *conscience* can include in it, beyond the exercise of the *judgment* in the particular department of morals. Even those who speak of it as if it were something different, or something more, are at the same time accustomed to use language about it that will hardly apply to it in any other view. They employ the common phrases. They speak of the *decisions* of conscience; of conscience being well or ill *informed*, and of these decisions being more or less *enlightened* and *just*, according to the information it possesses. When we speak of the pain which an awakened conscience inflicts, what more do we mean than the pain which arises from a conviction, brought home to the mind, of our having done wrong? The pain will be various in degree, according to the clearness and force of this conviction; according to the apprehension which the mind has of the intrinsic evil of sin in general, and of the nature and circumstantial aggravations of the particular transgression. The consciousness of the wrong done is not the pain, but the cause of the pain. When the apostle Paul says ' our rejoicing is this, the testimony of our conscience, that in simplicity and godly sincerity, not with fleshly wisdom, but by the grace of God, we have had our conversation in the world,' he does not mean to identify the *testimony* and the *joy*, but by a common figure of speech to assign the one as the cause of the other. But whether this simple view of the nature of conscience as a modification of the judging faculty, or rather as that faculty itself, exercised in a special department, be correct or not, the argument of the apostle is not in the least affected by either its soundness or its error. Whatever view we take of it, and by whatever name we call it, its office is to bear inward testimony to the good or the evil of our thoughts, and words, and actions."

Here Dr. Wardlaw deserves praise for being right, though not for being strictly consistent. He gives to conscience a higher office and authority than can properly belong to the mental constitution of a creature so radically depraved as he usually represents man to be. But he indirectly acknowledges that, though the disposition may be corrupt, the judgment may be pure and accurate; and that it is perfectly possible to distinguish between them. A bad man may, therefore, theorize on moral science as wisely and conclusively as the most pious of philosophers; the only difference is, that the emotions in the breast of the one will have

little resemblance to those which may have been excited in the other. Some writers have, indeed, attempted to separate in conscience the power that *determines*, from the power which *feels*; ascribing the former to the judgment, and the latter to a special susceptibility connected with our moral discernment. But we should object to this multiplication of original faculties; for as most of our intellectual operations are accompanied with feelings of pleasure or pain, admiration or disgust, approbation or dislike, we should soon find ourselves reduced to the necessity of creating as many distinct sources of emotion as there are distinguishable acts of the rational energies.

Leaving the field of abstract reasoning, in which his success is not very eminent, the author comes to the practical rule of duty, about which there is no dispute, and finds it, as might have been expected, in the identity of morality and religion—love to God, and love to our neighbour. The first, according to Dr. W., consists in “complacency in the divine character, gratitude for the divine goodness, and delight in the divine happiness.” We know not the precise import of the word “complacency,” as applied to our feelings towards the Almighty, that Being whom this writer has in one place described as the “great uncreated Spirit,” having a “pure, ethereal, invisible essence.” On this mysterious subject he is pleased to dilate as follows, in a style of thought borrowed from Edwards, and other transcendental divines:—“God is necessarily the highest object of complacent delight to himself—his own infinite excellence to his own infinite mind. He is himself at once the subject and the object of this complacency; in himself it exists, and on himself it terminates. Nothing short of infinite excellence can give scope for infinite delight; so that the infinite mind of Deity could not have a full expansion, or a perfect gratification of its capacities of enjoyment, except as exercised upon himself.” Complacency in God, regarded as a part of our duty, is “sympathy with the divine delight in the divine excellence.” Our “delight in the divine happiness” is a sentiment of a similar nature. A regenerated Christian “cannot but rejoice in his Maker’s joy—in the absolute, unmingled, independent, and immutable blessedness of the Father of all—whether flowing from his own exhaustless self-sufficiency, or from the accomplishment of the purposes of his goodness and righteousness. How pure, how sublime, how ennobling this sentiment of sympathy with the divine happiness!—a sentiment by which we enter into the heart of Deity, and hold a communion of holy delight with the eternal Fountain of life and joy,”

Had Dr. Wardlaw announced, at the beginning of his book, that it was his object to place the standard of *practical ethics*

on the firm basis of Divine revelation, we should have been able to follow his steps with greater confidence. But why then, all this minute criticism on the systems of Hobbes, Hutcheson, Hume, Butler, and Brown, who had quite a different end in view; namely, to determine by an analytical process, the particular qualities in human action or sentiment which command our esteem, and to delineate the mental faculty, whose office it is to judge and feel in such matters? In short, he had either nothing to do with the metaphysics of morality, or a great deal more than he has accomplished. He has shown considerable talent and power of writing; but owing to the want of precision in the leading principles of his undertaking, he has occasionally bewildered both himself and his reader. He uses his arms with vigour and activity, but he not unfrequently beats the air. He prostrates a variety of antagonists, as he walks along the field of his triumph; but if he had considered them well, he would have discovered that they were not enemies, though ranged under colours somewhat different from his own.



ART. V.—*Principles of Geology: being an Attempt to explain the former Changes of the Earth's Surface by Reference to Causes now in Operation.* By Charles Lyell, Esq. F.R.S. Professor of Geology to King's College, London. 3 vols. 8vo.

WE have been deeply interested in the extensive and well arranged information, as well as tasked in thought by the severe analysis displayed in Mr. Lyell's work upon Geology. It differs from most other treatises upon this rising and important science in a more copious and diversified collection of data from *all* quarters of the globe;—and its characteristic doctrine, though not original, is explained by some very novel illustrations. Its style is generally elegant,—often glowing with the author's impassioned love of his subject:—its details and arguments are relieved by imagination and poetry:—its spirit unexceptionably candid;—and altogether it forms the work, which (irrespectively of our views of the prevailing school of geology) we should recommend to a mind, that is vigorously resolved to cultivate this branch of philosophy.

In advocating the importance of geological science, we might, as its lowest recommendation, insist upon its connection with many purposes of practical utility. We might then take a higher ground, by proving its innumerable affinities with the processes of chemistry, and its contributions to the researches of mineralogy,

zoology, comparative anatomy and botany. So far we claim for it an *equal* footing with its sister sciences: but its *superiority* to them rests upon other grounds. Since it “investigates the successive changes that have taken place in the organic and inorganic kingdoms of nature, and inquires into the causes of those changes, and the influence which they have exerted, in modifying the surface and external structure of our planet;”—both as to the *space* and *time* which it embraces, it can yield to astronomy alone. The world is its laboratory, and its experiments commenced at the creation. It is the history of physical philosophy. Even on the supposition, that the primitive formation of our globe had continued unchanged, and that all its elements were in the exact relation to each other, which they held when God, as he rested from his works, pronounced all to be very good;—there would be exquisite interest in our inquiries.—How much more *now*, when changes and convulsions of the most astounding order fill up the interval! Geology proposes to make us in imagination spectators of these changes: from its first days discloses to us this world’s elements in incessant conflict, and by the active machinery of the volcano, the earthquake and deluge, brings us into communion with catastrophes the most sublime. It shows us, that what otherwise would be deemed the hyperbole of eastern diction, may be believed as the soberness of history:—“Then the earth shook and trembled, the foundations also of the hills moved and were shaken,” “the channels of waters have been seen, and the foundations of the earth have been discovered:”—and when the mind becomes fatigued with the excitement of such scenery, the ocean in her calmness, and the placid lake, and the streamlet, by submitting problems for its solution, soothe and refine it. It proves the earth to be one vast sepulchre, in which successive races of the animated creation are imperishably embalmed: and thus, by peopling past ages with living forms, novel and unparalleled, it surpasses the interest and originality of fiction. We contend therefore, that by bringing home to us images which taste can appreciate, by gratifying that love of novelty, which is so inherent in our constitution, without carrying it to absurdities, and by unfolding spectacles of grandeur, geology can demand notice from the poet as well as the philosopher, from the man of fancy as well as the lover of abstract calculation.

We would defy any intelligent mind, previously uninformed upon this science, to read through these volumes, without yielding this tribute of praise to geology and a corresponding approbation to the author: and having thus introduced him, we shall proceed to submit an epitome of his work, together with some incidental



remarks upon *his* peculiarities, and in the end, direct our readers to certain doctrines belonging to geologists *in general*, with which we are compelled to differ.

The second, third, and fourth chapters of the first volume are a concise history of the progress of the science from its infancy to its very recent revival. The most ancient cosmogonists, both Indian and Egyptian, believed and transmitted to some writers of the Grecian sects, the doctrine of the successive destruction and renovation of the world. This is to be gathered from the Institutes of Menù. Plutarch likewise affirms, that it was the theme of one of the hymns of Orpheus. Mr. Lyell conceives that this early theory had its source, partly from "those marks of former convulsions on every part of the surface of our planet which are so obvious and striking;" but chiefly, "in the exaggerated traditions of partial but dreadful catastrophes." From Ovid's *Metamorphoses* we find that Pythagoras anticipated the now received doctrines of geology, almost as accurately as he did the astronomical theory of Copernicus. He enumerates the conversion of solid land into sea and of sea into land, the excavation of vallies by running water, the action of earthquakes in closing springs, diverting rivers, now upheaving and now submerging plains, the formation of islands by the growth of deltas and deposits, and the agency of volcanoes, as indications of perpetual change and reproduction.

Aristotle, as may be learnt from his various works, was extensively acquainted with the destroying and renovating powers of nature, and this, added to some remarkable passages in his *Meteorics*, is a sufficient proof that he held the theory of periodical revolutions in the *inorganic* world. Strabo discusses, in the second book of his *Geography*, the problem, "by what cause marine shells came to be plentifully buried in the earth, at such great elevations and distances from the sea," refutes the proposed explanations of Xanthus and Strato, and proposes his own solution, "that the same land is sometimes raised up, and sometimes depressed, and the sea also is simultaneously raised and depressed, so that it either overflows or returns into its own place again." In summing up the opinions on geology, which had been entertained before the Christian era, Mr. Lyell concludes, that philosophers, whatever observations they had made as to modern changes, had not compared their results with those of remote eras; had not even conjectured respecting organic remains; and acquainted though they were with astronomy, and the animal, vegetable, and mineral kingdoms, "the ancient history of the globe was a sealed book to them."

In the tenth century, Omar an Arabian philosopher wrote a work on "the Retreat of the Sea," and vindicated his principles



by the disagreement of the actual appearance of the coasts of Asia with those which had been marked out, in the charts of some Indian and Persian astronomers, two thousand years before. During the five centuries of intellectual darkness which followed, there were no contributions whatever to geological science. At length, in 1517, the excavations which were made for repairing the city of Verona, disclosed a multitude of marine shells and other organized fossils, and thus awakened the controversy which continued for three centuries, whether these remains had ever belonged to living creatures, and if so, whether the deluge recorded in scripture explained the phenomena. Whilst some contended for a "plastic force" in nature, which converted stones into organic forms, Fracastoro exposed its absurdity, declared his opinion that fossils had belonged to living animals, but denied that the Mosaic deluge, transient as it was, could have so deeply deposited them in the earth. More than half a century had elapsed before Palissy dared in Paris to avow similar opinions. Differing, however, upon the question of the origin of fossilized remains, most of the eminent naturalists were induced by the popular prejudice to concede that they were proofs of an universal deluge.

"The theologians who now entered the field in Italy, Germany, France and England, were innumerable; and henceforward, they who refused to subscribe to the position, that all marine organic remains were proofs of the Mosaic deluge, were exposed to the imputation of disbelieving the whole of the sacred writings. Scarcely any step had been made in approximating to sound theories since the time of Fracastoro, more than a hundred years having been lost in writing down the dogma that organized fossils were mere sports of nature. An additional period of a century and a half was now destined to be consumed in exploding the hypothesis, that organized fossils had all been buried in the solid strata by the Noachian flood. Never did a theoretical fallacy, in any branch of science, interfere more seriously with accurate observation and the systematic classification of facts. In recent times, we may attribute our rapid progress chiefly to the careful determination of the order of succession in mineral masses, by means of their different organic contents, and their regular superposition. But the old diluvialists were induced by their system to confound all the groups of strata together instead of discriminating,—to refer all appearances to one cause and to one brief period, not to a variety of causes acting throughout a long succession of epochs. They saw the phenomena only as they desired to see them, sometimes misrepresenting facts, and at other times deducing false conclusions from correct data. Under the influence of such prejudices, three centuries were of as little avail, as a few years in our own times, when we are no longer required to propel the vessel against the force of an adverse current.—vol. i. p. 33, 34.

From the close of the 17th to the 18th century, the conflicting

theories of philosophers sometimes retarded and sometimes advanced the science. Hooke, whose treatise on earthquakes is the most philosophical production of the age, intimated the probability that certain species had suffered extinction,—and, from the fossilized turtles and large ammonites found in Portland, concluded that England once *lay under the sea within the torrid zone.*” He believed earthquakes to be the cause of the elevation of shells, fishes, and the like, to the summits of mountains,—impugned the prevailing diluvial theory, and substituted his own. Burnet, Whiston, Woodward, and Hutchinson, meanwhile, published their opinions,—which, as imaginative reveries, (for they deserved no higher designation,) retarded science, and weakened the authority of Scripture, by forced interpretations. Leibnitz published his *Protogæa* in 1680, in which he supposed that this planet was originally a burning luminous mass,—that ever since its creation it had been undergoing gradual refrigeration,—and that when sufficiently cooled, the vapours which had previously exhaled became condensed, and then fell and formed an universal ocean. Among the Italian geologists who still maintained a decided pre-eminence, Vallisneri and Lazzaro Moro refuted the systems of Burnet, Whiston, and Woodward. Generelli, the disciple and illustrator of Moro, has given us, not only an exposition of his master’s theory, but an interesting sketch of the state of geology in Europe, before the middle of the last century. The power of earthquakes in alternating lands and seas,—the superposition of different strata,—the existence of fossils in some rocks, and their absence in others,—their animal origin,—and the uniformity of nature’s operations, are the leading propositions which he strove to establish. Hitherto, however, no opinion respecting the extinction of certain species had gained any footing in Italy. Buffon, with but few modifications, received the doctrine of an universal ocean,—which Leibnitz had introduced,—when Michell, who minutely examined the stratification of rocks in Yorkshire,—Calcott, by his physico-theological disquisitions,—Raspe, by recalling the attention of the public to Hooke’s writings,—Soldani, by applying the science of zoology, “to illustrate the history of stratified masses,”—and Pallas and Saussure, by “distinguishing the mineral masses on our globe into separate groups, and showing their relations,” sustained the science in the public mind, until Werner and Hutton proposed their novel and important hypotheses. Werner, the celebrated professor of mineralogy at Freyburg, directed his attention “not only to the composition and external characters of minerals, but also to what he termed “*geognosy*,” or the natural position of minerals in particular rocks,—together with the grouping of those rocks, their geo-

graphical distribution, and various relations." The district which he examined was extremely limited, and almost uniform in the arrangement of its strata. It is obvious, then, how illogical, and how false, must be those conclusions which made him propound a theory of *universal* stratification, of which that of his neighbourhood was the type. But his principal error, and that one which awakened the most vehement controversy, regarded the origin of basalt and other igneous rocks.

"These basalts, and all other rocks of the same family in other countries, were, according to him, chemical precipitates from water. He denied that they were the products of submarine volcanos, and even taught that, in the primeval ages of the world, there were no volcanos. His theory was opposed, in a twofold sense, to the doctrine of uniformity in the course of nature; for not only did he introduce, without scruple, many imaginary causes supposed to have once effected great revolutions in the earth, and then to have become extinct, but new ones were also feigned to have come into play in modern times; and, above all, that most violent instrument of change, the agency of subterranean fire."—vol. i. p. 66.

Thus arose the controversy between the Vulcanists and the Neptunists. That there should have been advocates of the latter opinions, notwithstanding the constant citation of the most undeniable facts by their adversaries, only proves to us the powerful ascendancy which Werner's master spirit obtained and perpetuated over his inferiors. During this severe conflict the illustrious Hutton soon became the leader of the Vulcanists. He was the first to proclaim that geology did not inquire into "the origin of things:" the first who attempted to explode all gratuitous hypothesis, and to explain former changes by ordinary natural agents.

"'The ruins of an older world,' said Hutton, 'are visible in the present structure of our planet, and the strata which now compose our continents have been once beneath the sea, and were formed out of the waste of pre-existing continents. The same forces are still destroying, by chemical decomposition or mechanical violence, even the hardest rocks, and transporting the materials to the sea, where they are spread out, and form strata analogous to those of more ancient date. Although loosely deposited along the bottom of the ocean, they become altered and consolidated by volcanic heat, and then heaved up, fractured and contorted.'"—vol. i. p. 70.

The observations by which Hutton arrived at his conclusions respecting the igneous origin of even *granite*, are highly interesting.

"The absence of stratification in granite, and its analogy in mineral character to rocks which he deemed of igneous origin, led Hutton to

conclude that granite must also have been formed from matter in fusion, and this inference he felt could not be fully confirmed, unless he discovered at the contact of granite and other strata a repetition of the phenomena exhibited so constantly by the trap-rocks. Resolved to try his theory by this test, he went to the Grampians and surveyed the line of junction of the granite and superincumbent stratified masses, and found in Glen Tilt in 1785 the most clear and unequivocal proofs in support of his views. Veins of red granite are there seen branching out from the principal mass, and traversing the black micaceous schist and primary limestone. The intersected stratified rocks are so distinct in colour and appearance as to render the example in that locality most striking, and the alteration of the limestone in contact was very analogous to that produced by trap veins on calcareous strata. This verification of his system filled him with delight, and called forth such marks of joy and exultation, that the guides who accompanied him, says his biographer, were convinced that he must have discovered a vein of silver or gold. He was aware that the same theory would not explain the origin of the primary schists, but these he called primary, rejecting the term primitive, and was disposed to consider them as sedimentary rocks altered by heat, and that they originated in some other form from the waste of previously existing rocks."—vol. i. p. 70—71.

Thus originated the geological doctrine of the antiquity of our planet. The moment that Hutton affirmed that even primitive rocks,—“the original nucleus of the globe,”—were formed from matter in fusion, which had been but slowly refrigerated, he might well say, “in the economy of the world I can find no traces of a beginning, no prospect of an end.”

Hitherto, the argument for the antiquity of the earth, from geological monuments of revolutions in organic life, had been comparatively neglected,—and when Playfair undertook the illustration of his master's doctrines, he pointed to fossil remains, not for the purpose of characterizing different strata, but as the deposit of successive eras in animated creation.

In reply to those who accused Hutton of a belief in eternal succession, he contended “that it was one thing to declare that we had not yet discovered the traces of a beginning, and another to deny that the earth ever had a beginning.” Williams, a mineral surveyor of Edinburgh, Kirwan, the president of the Royal Academy of Dublin, and De Luc were the most vehement impugnors of Hutton's hypothesis. He was considered the enemy of Revelation: all the religious anxieties of the age, awakened to more than ordinary vigilance by the insinuations of Voltaire's infidelity, were enlisted against him: to be a Huttonian, was to be an Atheist. Amidst the bitter animosity of these rival schools, “a new one arose, professing the strictest neutrality and the utmost indifference to the systems of Werner and Hutton, and

who were resolved diligently to devote their labours to observations." We are thus arrived at the present era:—

"A great body of new data were required, and the Geological Society of London, founded in 1807, conducted greatly to the attainment of this desirable end. To multiply and record observations, and patiently to await the result at some future period, was the object proposed by them, and it was their favourite maxim that the time was not yet come for a general system of geology, but that all must be content for many years to be exclusively engaged in furnishing materials for future generalizations. By acting up to these principles with consistency, they in a few years disarmed all prejudice, and rescued the science from the imputation of being a dangerous, or at best but a visionary pursuit."—vol. i. p. 81, 82.

The geologists of France, during the present century, have been most successful in their examination of fossilized remains. Previous philosophers had arranged successive eras by the relations of mineralogical strata,—it is *now* found that, irrespectively of the order of superposition, an identity of organic vestiges is sufficient to prove those strata in which they are imbedded, though different from each other, to have been contemporaneous. "This," as Mr. Lyell observes, "may be pointed out as the characteristic feature of the progress of the science during the present century."

The fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, and ninth chapters of Mr. Lyell's first volume, contain very copious remarks upon "the question as to the discordance of the ancient and modern causes of change" in the earth's surface. From his history of the progress of the science, it is obvious that this has always been the leading topic of discussion. The first observers of geological monuments strenuously affirmed them to be the results of very different causes from those which are now in operation. The strata of our globe, diversified in character, torn, convulsed, and partially intermingled, have been referred to agencies which only theory, not observation, could suggest. And the progress or retardation of the science has just been in proportion as this method of solution has been abandoned or employed. It must, therefore, be most interesting to inquire into the sources of this obstinate adherence to hypothesis, and reluctance to patient and elaborate induction.

Our author adverts to the two most probable causes:—1st. prepossessions in regard to the duration of past times. 2d. Prejudices arising from our peculiar position as inhabitants of the land. For in regard to the *first*, the prevailing chronology has allotted but a few thousand years to the age of the world, whereas, in admitting the past invariable uniformity of nature, an indefinite lapse of time must be conceded, during which her

astounding experiments may have been performed. Not only must we deny the introduction of any supernatural agency, but also any unwonted acceleration in the force of ordinary causes. In regard to the *second*, viz. prejudices arising from our position as inhabitants of the land, it is clear that our point of observation is essentially unfavourable. We cannot watch the energetic forces which are ever in exertion in the sea: we cannot ascertain the state of melted matter in the depth of the volcano, or watch "the subterraneous rivers and reservoirs of liquid matter far beneath the surface." It is not wonderful, then, that on being told, that all the phenomena of the past, the birth of mountains, and retreat of oceans are referable to ordinary agency, we feel incredulous. Thus to both these considerations we may fairly (Mr. Lyell argues) attribute the disposition of past geologists to imagine in nature some supernatural and violent operation.

During the last forty years this theory has, notwithstanding, considerably gained ground. The two most striking geological discoveries of this period have become its subsidiaries. Formerly, the antiquity of the globe was *theoretically* conceded, in order to explain the superposition of sedimentary strata by causes now in action: in addition to this, it is *now* believed absolutely requisite, that we may at all account for the entombment of organic remains of various species in those strata. Moreover, whilst the Wernerian doctrine of universal formations remained unrefuted, it presented "unsurmountable objections to the supposition, that the earth's crust had been formed by causes now in action:" it consequently rendered the hypothesis of the earth's indefinite age superfluous. It is now universally exploded. There still remain, however, objections to the principle of invariable uniformity, two of which Mr. Lyell very fully canvasses. He admits that it must be concluded from many geological data, that different climates have interchanged their temperature; for example, that the northern hemisphere was formerly hotter: still he insists, and, by a most ingenious argument, very plausibly contends, that these vicissitudes of temperature are the *legitimate* effects of the existing order of nature. This is easy, if it can once be shown that climate is regulated by the distribution of land and sea: since geology, by proving that there are constant changes in that distribution—supposing it the cause, must prove also that there are changes in the climate—supposing it the consequent. As this is one of the most original discussions of his volumes, we shall call our readers to it somewhat particularly.

In inquiring into the causes of vicissitudes in temperature he remarks—

"It is now well ascertained that zones of equal warmth, both in the



atmosphere and in the waters of the ocean, are neither parallel to the equator nor to each other. It is also discovered that the same mean annual temperature may exist in two places which enjoy very different climates, for the seasons may be nearly equalized or violently contrasted. Thus the lines of equal winter temperature do not coincide with the lines of equal annual heat, or isothermal lines. The deviations of all these lines from the same parallel of latitude, are determined by a multitude of circumstances, among the principal of which are the position, direction, and elevation of the continents and islands, the position and depth of the sea, and the direction of currents and of winds.

“ It is necessary to go northwards in Europe in order to find the same mean quantity of annual heat as in a similar latitude in North America. On comparing these two continents, it is found that places situated in the same latitudes have sometimes a mean difference of temperature amounting to  $11^{\circ}$ , or even sometimes  $17^{\circ}$ , of Fahrenheit; and places on the two continents, which have the same mean temperature, have sometimes a difference in latitude of from  $7^{\circ}$  to  $13^{\circ}$ . The principal cause of greater intensity of cold in corresponding latitudes of North America and Europe, is the connexion of the former country with the polar circle, by a large tract of land, some of which is from three to five thousand feet in height, and, on the other hand, the separation of Europe from the arctic circle by an ocean. The ocean has a tendency to preserve every where a mean temperature, which it communicates to the contiguous land, so that it tempers the climate, moderating alike an excess of heat or cold. The elevated land, on the other hand, rising to the colder regions of the atmosphere, becomes a great reservoir of ice and snow, attracts, condenses, and congeals vapour, and communicates its cold to the adjoining country. For this reason, Greenland, forming part of a continent which stretches northward to the  $82^{\text{d}}$  degree of latitude, experiences under the  $60^{\text{th}}$  parallel a more rigorous climate than Lapland under the  $72^{\text{d}}$  parallel.

“ But if land be situated between the  $40^{\text{th}}$  parallel and the equator, it produces, unless it be of extreme height, exactly the opposite effect, for it then warms the tracts of land or sea that intervene between it and the polar circle. For the surface being in this case exposed to the vertical or nearly vertical rays of the sun, absorbs a large quantity of heat, which it diffuses by radiation into the atmosphere. For this reason, the western parts of the old continent derive warmth from Africa, ‘which, like an immense furnace, says Malte-Brun, ‘distributes its heat to Arabia; to Turkey in Asia, and to Europe.’ On the contrary, Asia, in its north-eastern extremity, experiences in the same latitude extreme cold, for it has land on the north between the  $60^{\text{th}}$  and  $70^{\text{th}}$  parallel, while to the south it is separated from the equator by the North Pacific.

“ In consequence of the more equal temperature of the waters of the ocean, the climate of islands and coasts differs essentially from that of the interior of continents, the former being characterized by mild winters and more temperate summers; for the sea breezes moderate the cold of winter, as well as the summer heat. When, therefore, we trace round the globe those belts in which the mean annual temperature is the same, we often find great differences in climate; for there are *insular*



climates where the seasons are nearly equalized, and *excessive* climates as they have been termed, where the temperature of winter and summer is strongly contrasted. The whole of Europe, compared with the eastern parts of America and Asia, has an insular climate. The northern part of China, and the Atlantic region of the United States, exhibit 'excessive climates.' We find at New York, says Humboldt, the summer of Rome and the winter of Copenhagen; at Quebec the summer of Paris and the winter of Petersburg. At Pekin, in China, where the mean temperature of the year is that of the coast of Brittany, the scorching heats of summer are greater than at Cairo, and the winters as rigorous as at Upsal.

"If lines be drawn round the globe through all those places which have the same winter temperature, they are found to deviate from the terrestrial parallels much farther than the lines of equal mean annual heat. For the lines of equal winter in Europe are often curved so as to reach parallels of latitude  $9^{\circ}$  or  $10^{\circ}$  distant from each other, whereas the isothermal lines only differ from  $4^{\circ}$  to  $5^{\circ}$ ."—vol. i. p. 122—124.

These statements in physical geography are incontestible. It is equally clear, that the influence of currents upon temperature must be considerable. Mr. Lyell mentions for example the gulf stream, which having passed the Straits of Bahama "runs northwards at the rate of four miles an hour, and retains in the parallel of  $38^{\circ}$ , nearly 1000 miles from the above strait, a temperature  $10^{\circ}$  Fahrenheit warmer than the air." That this materially affects the temperature of Europe must be very certain. The leading illustration of the dependence of heat upon the ratio between land and sea, is the difference of climate of the northern and southern hemispheres.

"The dry land in the southern hemisphere is to that of the northern in the ratio only of one to three, excluding from our consideration that part which lies between the pole and the  $74^{\circ}$  of south latitude, which has hitherto proved inaccessible. The predominance of ice in the antarctic over the arctic zone is very great; for that which encircles the southern pole extends to lower latitudes by ten degrees than that around the north pole. It is probable that this remarkable difference is partly attributable, as Cook conjectured, to the existence of a considerable tract of high land between the 70th parallel of south latitude and the pole. There is, however, another reason suggested by Humboldt, to which great weight is due,—the small quantity of land in the tropical and temperate zones south of the line. If Africa and New Holland extended farther to the south, a diminution of ice would take place in consequence of radiation of heat from these continents during summer, which would warm the contiguous sea and rarify the air. The heated aerial currents would then ascend and flow more rapidly towards the south pole, and moderate the winter. In confirmation of these views, it is stated that the cap of ice which extends as far as the  $68^{\circ}$  and  $71^{\circ}$  of south latitude, advances more towards the equator whenever it meets a free sea; that is, wherever the extremities of the present continents are

not opposite to it; and this circumstance seems explicable only on the principle above alluded to, of the radiation of heat from the lands so situated."—p. 126, 127.

"But, whatever may now be the inferiority of heat in the temperate and arctic zones south of the line, it is quite evident that the cold would be far more intense if there happened, instead of open sea, to be tracts of elevated land between the 55th and 70th parallel; for, in Sandwich Island, in 54° and 58° of south latitude, the perpetual snow and ice reach to the sea beach; and what is still more astonishing, in the island of Georgia, which is in the 53° south latitude, or the same parallel as the central counties of England, the perpetual snow descends to the level of the ocean. When we consider this fact, and then recollect that the highest mountains in Scotland do not attain the limit of perpetual snow on this side of the equator, we learn that latitude is one only of many powerful causes, which determine the climate of particular regions of the globe. The permanence of snow in the southern hemisphere, in this instance, is partly due to the floating ice, which chills the atmosphere and condenses the vapour, so that in summer the sun cannot pierce through the foggy air."—vol. i. p. 127, 128.

If these positions are conceded, and we confess, we perceive no especial difficulties against them,—on our adding to them "those endless variations in the geographical features of our planet" which are proved from geology, Mr. Lyell's theory *must* follow, viz. that changes in climate are not the irregularities, but ordinary results of the present economy.

Having thus disposed of the *first* of the objections, *still* adduced against absolute uniformity in the order of nature, our author proceeds to the *second*, which he styles "the theory of the progressive developement of organic life." The full force of this objection he very candidly exhibits by a quotation from the late lamented Sir H. Davy.

" 'It is impossible,' he affirms, 'to defend the proposition, that the present order of things is the ancient and constant order of nature, only modified by existing laws—in those strata which are deepest, and which must, consequently, be supposed to be the earliest deposited, forms even of vegetable life are rare; shells and vegetable remains are found in the next order; the bones of fishes and oviparous reptiles exist in the following class; the remains of birds, with those of the same genera mentioned before, in the next order; those of quadrupeds of extinct species in a still more recent class; and it is only in the loose and slightly-consolidated strata of gravel and sand, and which are usually called diluvian formations, that the remains of animals such as now people the globe are found, with others belonging to extinct species. But, in none of these formations, whether called secondary, tertiary, or diluvial, have the remains of man, or any of his works, been discovered; and whoever dwells upon this subject must be convinced, that the present order of things, and the comparatively recent existence of man, as

the master of the globe, is as certain as the destruction of a former and different order, and the extinction of a number of living forms which have no types in being. In the oldest secondary strata there are no remains of any such animals as now belong to the surface; and in the rocks, which may be regarded as more recently deposited, these remains occur but rarely, and with abundance of extinct species;—there seems, as it were, a gradual approach to the present system of things, and a succession of destructions and creations preparatory to the existence of man.'

"In the above passages, the author deduces two important conclusions from geological data: first, that in the successive groups of strata, from the oldest to the most recent, there is a progressive development of organic life, from the simplest to the most complicated forms;—secondly, that man is of comparatively recent origin. It will be easy to show that the first of these propositions, though very generally received, has no foundation in fact. The second, on the contrary, is indisputable, and it is important, therefore, to consider how far its admission is inconsistent with the assumption, that the system of the natural world has been uniform from the beginning, or rather from the era when the oldest rocks hitherto discovered were formed."—vol. i. p. 166, 167.

Facts give the most decided refutation to the *first* of this great chemist's propositions. It is allowed, that there is a considerable paucity of the rarest species of animal fossils in the oldest sedimentary strata: but that there are any—that remains of vertebrated animals *have* been found imbedded in them,—is most fatal to the theory of successive developement. He who allots distinct eras to the exclusive possession of certain grades of animated nature, and attempts to prove it by the characteristic deposits of successive strata, must immediately resign his theory when there are produced the oldest specimens containing various genera *together*. This must determine both vegetable species, corals, testacea, and the higher order of animals to have been contemporaneous. Even at the earliest period, from the European sedimentary rocks, (from the graywacke to the coal inclusive,) there have been collected vertebrated animals;—the remains of fish are in the lowest strata;—and scales of a tortoise, nearly allied to the trionyx, are frequently discovered from the bituminous schists of Caithness; schists confidently pronounced by Professor Sedgwick and Mr. Murchison to be of the age of old red sandstone.

Somewhat, though not precisely connected with this question, is the theory of transmutation of species, avowed by some philosophers of the French school, particularly Lamarck. Mr. Lyell has manfully grappled with the whole of this sceptic's absurdities, in the commencement of the second volume of this work. There is however one simple fact, which, in itself, renders more elaborate

rate arguments needless. Zoophytes, which in form are similar to plants, were regarded by Lamarck the link between vegetable and animal creation. We quote an extract from the eighteenth volume of the *Edinburgh Encyclopedia*, p. 843, "Zoophytes appear to feed principally on infusoria, (or sea animalcula,) and they required only the existence of that class to prepare the sea for their creation. Their remains form the oldest fossil animals met with in the strata of the earth." This alone proves, that if we regarded any scale of gradation, animal existences must be placed anterior to this semi-vegetable species.

Mr. Lyell agrees with the second proposition of Sir Humphrey Davy,—that man, as an inhabitant of the world, is of very recent comparative origin. We shall defer our own remarks upon the doctrine itself, until we more systematically express our dissent from it and several others of these volumes. The question before us is,—does it contravene the theory of uniformity in the course of nature? Let us refer to our author's answer.

"Is not the interference of the human species, it may be asked, such a deviation from the antecedent course of physical events, that the knowledge of such a fact tends to destroy all our confidence in the uniformity of the order of nature, both in regard to time past and future? If such an innovation could take place after the earth had been exclusively inhabited for thousands of ages by inferior animals, why should not other changes as extraordinary and unprecedented happen from time to time? If one new cause was permitted to supervene, differing in kind and energy from any before in operation, why may not others have come into action at different epochs? Or what security have we that they may not arise hereafter? If such be the case, how can the experience of one period, even though we are acquainted with all the possible effects of the then existing causes, be a standard to which we can refer all natural phenomena of other periods?"

"Now these objections would be unanswerable, if adduced against one who was contending for the absolute uniformity throughout all time of the succession of sublunary events—if, for example, he was disposed to indulge in the philosophical reveries of some Egyptian and Greek sects, who represented all the changes both of the moral and material world as repeated at distant intervals, so as to follow each other in their former connexion of place and time. For they compared the course of events on our globe to astronomical cycles, and not only did they consider all sublunary affairs to be under the influence of the celestial bodies, but they taught that on the earth, as well as in the heavens, the same identical phenomena recurred again and again in a perpetual vicissitude. The same individual men were doomed to be re-born, and to perform the same actions as before; the same arts were to be invented, and the same cities built and destroyed. The Argonautic expedition was destined to sail again with the same heroes, and Achilles with his myrmidons, to renew the combat before the walls of Troy.

‘ Alter erit tum Tiphys et altera quæ vebat Argo  
Dilectos heroas; erunt etiam altera bella,  
Atque iterum ad Trojam magnus mittetur Achilles.’

“ The geologist, however, may condemn these tenets as absurd, without running into the opposite extreme, and denying that the order of nature has, from the earliest periods, been uniform in the same sense in which we believe it to be uniform at present. We have no reason to suppose, that when man first became master of a small part of the globe, a greater change took place in its physical condition than is now experienced when districts, never before inhabited, become successively occupied by new settlers. When a powerful European colony lands on the shores of Australia, and introduces at once those arts which it has required many centuries to mature; when it imports a multitude of plants and large animals from the opposite extremity of the earth, and begins rapidly to extirpate many of the indigenous species, a mightier revolution is effected in a brief period, than the first entrance of a savage horde, or their continued occupation of the country for many centuries, can possibly be imagined to have produced. If there be no impropriety in assuming that the system is uniform when disturbances so unprecedented occur in certain localities, we can with much greater confidence apply the same language to those primeval ages when the aggregate number and power of the human race, or the rate of their advancement in civilization, must be supposed to have been far inferior.

“ If the barren soil around Sidney had at once become fertile upon the landing of our first settlers; if, like the happy isles whereof the poets have given us such glowing descriptions, those sandy tracts had begun to yield spontaneously an annual supply of grain, we might then, indeed, have fancied alterations still more remarkable in the economy of nature to have attended the first coming of our species into the planet. Or if, when a volcanic island like Ischia was, for the first time, brought under cultivation by the enterprise and industry of a Greek colony, the internal fire had become dormant, and the earthquake had remitted its destructive violence, there would then have been some ground for speculating on the debilitation of the subterranean forces, when the earth was first placed under the dominion of man. But after a long interval of rest, the volcano bursts forth again with renewed energy, annihilates one half of the inhabitants, and compels the remainder to emigrate. Such exiles, like the modern natives of Cumana, Calabria, Sumbawa, and other districts, habitually convulsed by earthquakes, would probably form no very exalted estimate of the sagacity of those geological theorists, who, contrasting the *human* with antecedent epochs, have characterized it as *the period of repose*.

“ In reasoning on the state of the globe immediately before our species was called into existence, we may assume that all the present causes were in operation, with the exception of man, until some geological arguments can be adduced to the contrary. We must be guided by the same rules of induction as when we speculate on the state of America in the interval that elapsed between the period of the introduction of man into Asia, the cradle of our race, and that of the arrival of the first adventurers on the shores of the New World. In that interval, we

imagine the state of things to have gone on according to the order now observed in regions unoccupied by man. Even now, the waters of lakes, seas, and the great ocean, which teem with life, may be said to have no immediate relation to the human race—to be portions of the terrestrial system of which man has never taken, nor ever can take, possession; so that the greater part of the inhabited surface of the planet remains still as insensible to our presence, as before any isle or continent was appointed to be our residence.”—vol. i. p. 180—183.

Hitherto we have refrained from any marked disapprobation of Mr. Lyell's hypotheses and reasonings:—here we are compelled to withhold our concurrence. His defence is in brief this;—that because some expatriots have penetrated the pathless forests of their new settlements, have brought all their animal, vegetable, and mineral productions into their service, without supervening one new law of nature;—that therefore the earth may have been for ages tenanted by the beasts of the field, its oceans may have teemed with life, its forests may have waved, its earthquakes, its storms and volcanoes may have struggled in mighty strife, in *irrational* solitude, and yet have been essentially unaltered when man's pure immaterial mind suddenly claimed their fellowship.

Now we do not pretend that man by the efforts of his mind can annihilate any law of nature, so as *thus* to destroy the uniformity of its course; but we must insist that his intercourse with the irrational (we speak not of the material) world, does exhibit *new* laws. Let us select one instance. It would be insulting to our readers to submit proofs, that the brute species are conscious of the essential distinction between man and even the most sagacious of their fellows, and that this consciousness, developed in the docility and subordination of many of them, would in such a case be a *new* law in their economy. Now the whole of Mr. Lyell's argumentation is to exclude any new, any extraordinary agency in the order of nature; to exclude—to use an old-fashioned but scriptural phrase—any miraculous interposition. What are the laws of matter but those rules which the Divine Mind observes in the conduct of the material economy? Suppose him for ages to controul them *immediately*, does he introduce no new *mediate* laws, when he forms man's mind and empowers its instrumentality?

But again—Mr. Lyell virtually admits that “successive developement” is irreconcilable with his favourite principle. In fact, Sir Humphrey Davy adduces it to disprove “that the present order of things is the ancient and constant order of nature.” Thus if each era in our planet's history had its characteristic species, in addition to those accumulated from past eras, this would destroy “uniformity.” Our author, we say, obviously admits this; and yet denies that the addition of the human species—so new, so distinct an order of beings from all other



animals—involves the same difficulty. We make these remarks without at present giving our opinion upon the theory, but to show that in this work it is not, in the above particulars, satisfactorily substantiated.

We have devoted so much attention to this principle of Mr. Lyell's geological belief, because it is the characteristic of his work. At the tenth chapter, at which we have now arrived, assuming that he has removed all difficulties, he enters on the more formal proof "that all former changes of the organic and inorganic creation are referable to one uninterrupted succession of physical events governed by the laws now in operation." In the establishment of this hypothesis, of course the most logical method is first to inquire what are the laws that are *now* in operation, and, secondly, whether their agency could have produced such geological results as have been discovered. This is chiefly our author's plan; the two introductory volumes, as they embrace modern processes, are but preliminary to the third, which is a comparison between them and the results of ancient data. Having enumerated several errors arising from a disregard to a method so laborious, he says,—

"In regard to the subjects treated of in our first two volumes, if systematic treatises had been written on these topics, we should willingly have entered at once upon the description of geological monuments properly so called, referring to other authors for the elucidation of elementary and collateral questions, just as we shall appeal to the best authorities in conchology and comparative anatomy, in proof of many positions which, but for the labours of naturalists devoted to these departments, would have demanded long digressions.

"But since in our attempt to solve geological problems, we shall be called upon to refer to the operation of aqueous and igneous causes, the geographical distribution of animals and plants, the real existence of species, their successive extinction, and so forth, we were under the necessity of collecting together a variety of facts, and of entering into long trains of reasoning, which could only be accomplished in preliminary treatises.

"These topics we regard as constituting the alphabet and grammar of geology; not that we expect from such studies to obtain a key to the interpretation of all geological phenomena, but because they form the groundwork from which we must rise to the contemplation of more general questions relating to the complicated results to which, in an indefinite lapse of ages, the existing causes of change may give rise."—vol. iii. p. 7.

His first general arrangement divides the changes of the inorganic and organic world, which are at present in operation. Of the *aqueous* agents, he specifies and copiously illustrates, severally, the destroying, transporting and reproductive powers of running water, tides and currents. The falls of Niagara, which, in consequence of their erosive action, have already receded seven miles



from the scene of the original cataract; the destruction of the town of Tivoli, in 1826, caused by the inundation of the river Anio; Rennell's estimate of the mud carried down by the Ganges, (which we shall subsequently have cause more particularly to specify); and the formation of islands by deltas; are amongst the most striking of the effects of running water. The waste which is continually occurring upon the coasts of Suffolk, Sussex and Portland in particular, and the progressive filling up of the German ocean, are his chief illustrations of decay and reproduction from the action of tides and currents.

Of the *igneous* agents which are now in exertion, our author mentions, specifically, the volcano and the earthquake. He considers them to be effects of the same subterranean process, though they originate very different phenomena on the surface of the globe. Our limits will not allow us to enter minutely on his details:—he introduces us to a vast amphitheatre, in which there are displayed, in uninterrupted activity, forces of the mightiest prowess, ever and anon destroying or renovating the surface of our planet.

Generally considered, Mr. Lyell regards these aqueous and igneous agents as antagonist forces.

“The *aqueous* agents are incessantly labouring to reduce the inequalities of the earth's surface to a level, while the *igneous*, on the other hand, are equally active in restoring the unevenness of the external crust, partly by heaping up new matter in certain localities, and partly by depressing one portion, and forcing out another of the earth's envelope.”—vol. i. p. 192.

The total estimate of the effects of this antagonism is well worthy our attention.

“The renovating as well as the destroying causes are unceasingly at work, the repair of land being as constant as its decay, and the deepening of seas keeping pace with the formation of shoals. If, in the course of a century, the Ganges and other great rivers have carried down to the sea a mass of matter equal to many lofty mountains, we also find that a district in Chili, one hundred thousand square miles in area, has been uplifted to the average height of a foot or more, and the cubic contents of the granitic mass thus added in a few hours to the land, may have counterbalanced the loss effected by the aqueous action of many rivers in a century. On the other hand, if the water displaced by fluvial sediment cause the mean level of the ocean to rise in a slight degree, such subsidences of its bed, as that of Cutch in 1819, or St. Domingo in 1751, or Jamaica, in 1692, may have compensated by increasing the capacity of the great oceanic basin. No river can push forward its delta without raising the level of the whole ocean, although in an infinitesimal degree; and no lowering can take place in the bed of any part of the ocean, without a general sinking of the water, even to the antipodes.”—vol. i. p. 546, 547.

The second volume is wholly occupied with the changes which are now taking place in the organic world; to what vicissitudes *species* may be subject; and how far "the influence of the powers of vitality" may be said to modify the surface and crust of the earth. In such a discussion it is unavoidable that "the real existence of species in nature" should be a prominent inquiry. Mr. Lyell conceives that variability in them is perfectly consistent with a belief that the limits of deviation are fixed. The laws which regulate the geographical distribution of species, inclusive of man,—and the possible extinction of some orders, are the next topics. It would be premature, he says, to discuss with any confidence, whether the loss of animals from time to time is compensated by the introduction of new species. The remainder of the volume considers, "1st. In what manner animal and vegetable remains become included and preserved in solid deposits on emerged land, or that part of the surface which is not *permanently* covered by water, whether of the sea or lakes; secondly, the manner in which organic remains become imbedded in subaqueous deposits."

Any thing more than a most cursory notice of the third volume would involve us in the innumerable disquisitions of the ancient geology. It displays less originality and investigation than the two preceding ones; but, as a whole, it is the best collection with which we are acquainted of the arrangements and principles of the prevailing theory.

Having, according to the generally received order, disposed the strata into the primary, secondary and tertiary—accounted for the origin of the primary, and the characteristic of the transition formations—the difference between the secondary and tertiary strata, with the distinctive circumstances under which they may have originated—the cause of interruption in the sequence of formations, and their chronological relations—Mr. Lyell specially directs his attention to the classification of the tertiary in *their* order. Since fossil remains are now received as the proper standard of arrangement, there are four subdivisions of the tertiary epoch; viz. the newer Pliocene, the older Pliocene, the Miocene and Eocene period. The *first* includes those groups of strata in which the major part of its fossil testacea are referable to *recent* species; the *second* contains, of these remains, but the proportion of a third of the entire numbers; the *third* has but a minority of fossil shells which are of recent species; and the *last*, by possessing but *an extremely small* proportion of such fossils, must be considered the commencement or dawn of the existing state of the animated creation. We subjoin a very interesting synopsis of these recent and tertiary formations.

## SYNOPTICAL TABLE OF RECENT AND TERTIARY FORMATIONS.

PERIODS.	Character of Formations.	Localities of the different Formations.
I. RECENT.....	Marine.	{ Coral formation of Pacific. Delta of Po, Ganges, &c.
	Freshwater.	{ Modern deposits in Lake Superior— Lake of Geneva—Marl Lakes of Scot- land—Italian travertin, &c.
	Volcanic.	{ Jourolo — Monte-Nuovo — Modern lavas of Iceland, Etna, Vesuvius, &c.
II. TERTIARY.	1. Newer Pliocene.	Marine. { Strata of the Val di Noto in Sicily, Ischia, Morea? Uddevalla.
		Freshwater. { Valley of the Elsa around Colle in Tus- cany.
		Volcanic. { Older parts of Vesuvius, Etna, and Ischia—Volcanic rocks of the Val di Noto in Sicily.
	2. Older Pliocene.	Marine. { Northern Subapennine formations, as at Parma, Asti, Sienna, Perpignan, Nice—English Crag.
		Freshwater. { Alternating with marine beds near the town of Sienna.
		Volcanic. { Volcanos of Tuscany and Campagna di Roma.
	3. Miocene.	Marine. { Strata of Touraine, Bordeaux, Valley of the Bormida, and the Superga near Turin—Basin of Vienna.
		Freshwater. { Alternating with marine at Saucats, twelve miles south of Bordeaux.
		Volcanic. { Hungarian and Transylvanian volcanic rocks. Part of the volcanos of Auvergne, Can- tal, and Velay?
	4. Eocene.	Marine. Paris and London basins.
		Freshwater. { Alternating with marine in Paris basin —Isle of Wight—purely lacustrine in Auvergne, Cantal and Velay.
		Volcanic. { Oldest part of volcanic rocks of Au- vergne.

The subsequent portions of the volume are mainly but illustrations of this synopsis. Throughout the whole, the connection between it and the two preceding volumes is very closely maintained, and there unquestionably passes through the mind of the reader the certain consciousness that he is only investigating (generally speaking) the ancient consequences of the same laws and agencies which now distinguish the revolutions around him.

And now, having furnished our readers with as condensed an outline as possible of Mr. Lyell's doctrines and his arguments in support of them, we shall offer a few remarks upon two or three of his theories in which we cannot acquiesce.

We are very far from supposing that he is indifferent to the authority of Divine Revelation. We hope and believe, that if he thought there was any such discrepancy between his philosophical belief and the Inspired Record, as really affected the credibility of the latter, he would for this single reason renounce the former. At least we should expect this, from several remarks in his work, in which he shows a solicitude to reconcile them.

The attempts which have been made by many physico-theological writers, to prove that the Scriptures use a strictly philosophical language, have always appeared to us unsatisfactory and highly injurious both to science and religion. For it is undeniable that there are some passages in Holy Writ, the phraseology of which, if received without the least modification in meaning, is at variance with many physical demonstrations. "The sides," "the ends," "the pillars" of the earth, is not the language of astronomy. We think therefore that, without any undue latitudinarianism, we may regard such phrases as of popular usage. The inspired penmen have chosen to employ *them*, since more correct ones, during the infancy of science, would have bewildered men's minds,—like mysterious whispers from another world,—and by distracting the attention, would have weakened the effect of their spiritual revelations.

No one will suspect the illustrious Bacon of indifference to Scriptural authority; and yet we find him writing,

"In interpretandi modo soluto duo interveniunt excessus. Alter, ejusmodi præsupponit in Scripturis perfectionem, ut etiam omnis philosophia ex earum fontibus peti debeat; ac si philosophia alia quævis, res profana esset et ethnica . . . . . Verum istiusmodi homines non id assequuntur quod volunt, neque enim honorem, ut putant, Scripturis deferunt, sed easdem potius deprimunt et polluunt . . . . . Quemadmodum enim theologiam in philosophia quærere perinde est, ac si vivos quæras inter mortuos: ita e contra philosophiam in theologia quærere non aliud est, quam mortuos quærere inter vivos."\*

So far we can conscientiously receive the apparent discrepancies between Philosophy and Scripture. But when the latter

\* De Augment. Scien. vol. vii. p. 471.

furnishes us with *natural history*; when, in recording those facts, which under such a name must be classified, it no longer indulges in generalities, but becomes specific and minute; when it observes the chronology and physical relation of events,—then assuredly its statements ought to be accredited just as fully as when it details to us the rise and fall of dynasties, the arrangements of redemption, or the prospects of the church. To understand its style as if it were metaphorical THEN, would be sapping the foundation of our faith:—for after such an admission of this principle of interpretation, we should be driven to view *all* Scripture as metaphor, and the beings whose existence it affirms would become but the sylphs and fairies of the imagination, the acts of the Gospel but an unmeaning drama, and the Deity but a shadow.

Whilst we use this language, we perfectly agree with the opinion of a celebrated writer on this science:—

“The general connexion of physical science will be rather with *natural* than *revealed* religion: for in the former, the great problem will be to trace the Author of Nature in his works; thus the connexion is *essential*. But that with revelation is incidental only, and confined to such facts as happen to be mentioned in relation to the providential history of man, its great object.”\*

Yet, whilst it would be preposterous to attempt to frame a general system of physics, or of any one branch of physics, from revelation, these incidental, disjointed facts, are *scientific*. They are true or they are false. No believer in the Bible can admit the latter alternative; as to the former, since truth is unalterable, that system which is in opposition to it must, in respect to the point of opposition, be untenable. ‘What, then, should be our principles of investigation?’ some ingenious student of this science may be disposed to ask us. ‘Whatever are our geological discoveries, and whatever the conclusions to which they most probably conduct us, shall we instantly relinquish the one and repudiate the other, because of their discrepancy with Scripture? Shall this be the “ultima thule” of our research?’ We answer, that as from our previous argument, we regard certain statements in Scripture to be irrefragable,—we are sure that the science as it advances will only approximate the nearer to agreement with them; they are as monuments of antiquity to the chronologer, which none of his reasonings or data ought to falsify; but as geology is only in its youth, as new discoveries and new inferences from them are ever soliciting our notice, let the philosopher keep his scientific creed in suspense; let his *present* disagreement with Divine Truth be a fresh reason for the ardour of his investiga-

\* Introduction to Geol. of Eng. and Wales, p. 51.

tions, and at least let him not discredit a book whose harmony of parts, whose purity, whose fulfilled prophecies, whose moral successes attest its divinity, for the sake of an unsystematic mass of physical facts, which cannot yet be fully harmonized with themselves.

We cannot forbear to quote a passage on this subject from the Introductory Essay of Mr. Conybeare.

“ With respect to the former class,” he says, alluding to the sceptical inferences of some geologists, “ with respect to the former class, the characteristic to which we have just alluded, their impatience, namely, to avail themselves of the immature results of an imperfect knowledge, opposed as it is in every respect to that persevering and reflective spirit of inquiry which marks genuine philosophy, and can alone lead to the ultimate discovery of truth, must create a reasonable suspicion of their opinions; for no sooner has any discovery, whatever might have been its subject, occurred (whether it was a fragment of Indian chronology, or an Egyptian zodiac, or the mechanism of the universe, or that of living bodies, or lastly some new fact relating to the structure of the earth,) than the first aspect under which some minds have seemed anxious to view it, has been, whether it would not furnish some new weapon against Revelation. Whether such a mode of proceeding was more likely to arise from a genuine desire to remove prejudice and bigotry, or rather was itself the fruit of a prejudiced and bigoted eagerness to propagate peculiar opinions, we do not feel called upon to decide.”

With these general views upon the philosophy of Scripture, and the test by which all the discoveries of geology should be examined, we must record our disagreement with our author. His doctrine of the absolute uniformity of nature, which we have already somewhat fully considered, leads inevitably in our opinion to some anti-scriptural inferences. We cannot reconcile it with the chronology and miraculous records of Divine truth.

Our readers must now be aware of its connexion with the supposed antiquity of the earth. It may, however, be advisable to recall it to their attention, by a quotation from Mr. Lyell. In deprecating the study of geological changes with any prepossession as to the limit of this world's age, he says—

“ He who would study the monuments of the natural world, under the influence of a similar infatuation, must draw a no less exaggerated picture of the energy and violence of causes, and must experience the same insurmountable difficulty in reconciling the former and present state of nature. If we could behold in one view all the volcanic cones thrown up in Iceland, Italy, Sicily, and other parts of Europe, during the last five thousand years, and could see the lavas which have flowed during the same period; the dislocations, subsidences, and elevations caused by earthquakes; the lands added to various deltas, or devoured by the sea, together with the effects of devastation by floods, and imagine that all these events had happened in one year, we must form most exalted ideas of the activity of the agents, and the suddenness of

the revolutions. Were an equal amount of change to pass before our eyes in the next year, could we avoid the conclusion that some great crisis of nature was at hand? If geologists, therefore, have misinterpreted the signs of a succession of events, so as to conclude that centuries were implied where the characters imported thousands of years, and thousands of years where the language of nature signified millions, they could not, if they reasoned logically from such false premises, come to any other conclusion, than that the system of the natural world had undergone a complete revolution."—vol. i. p. 89, 90.

Thus, as our globe abounds with monuments of the most extensive changes and convulsions, in order to control their vehemence, by distributing it through a lengthened process, and to avoid the existence of any extraordinary acceleration, we must suppose thousands of years to have existed where we have generally allotted centuries, and millions where we have assigned thousands. Indeed, Mr. Lyell's eagerness to secure sufficient time for the past developement of our planet's operations, is somewhat amusing. In his view, even the Huttonian claimants are not sufficiently indefinite:

"We cannot reflect on the concessions thus extorted from us in regard to the duration of past time, without foreseeing that the period may arrive when part of the Huttonian theory will be combated on the ground of its departing too far from the assumption of uniformity in the order of nature. On a closer investigation of extinct volcanos, we find proofs that they broke out at successive eras, and that the eruptions of one group were often concluded long before others had commenced their activity. Some were burning when one class of organic beings were in existence, others came into action when different races of animals and plants existed,—it follows, therefore, that the convulsions caused by subterranean movements, which are merely another portion of the volcanic phenomena, occurred also in succession, and their effects must be divided into separate sums, and assigned to separate periods of time; and this is not all: when we examine the volcanic products, whether they be lavas which flowed out under water or upon dry land, we find that intervals of time, often of great length, intervened between their formation, and that the effects of one eruption were not greater in amount than that which now results during ordinary volcanic convulsions. The accompanying or preceding earthquakes, therefore, may be considered to have been also successive, and to have been in like manner interrupted by intervals of time, and not to have exceeded in violence those now experienced in the ordinary course of nature."—vol. i. p. 100.

Neither our limits nor our design would allow us to enter upon any scientific refutation of this theory. Did we attempt it, it would be sufficient to show that such are the incalculable forces of nature now in operation, that 6000 years are an adequate period for similar forces to have produced the evident geological results. As a single instance of the mode in which we should



prosecute this purpose, we refer our readers to the following extract from a recently published volume. In order to understand it, we are to recollect that it is universally conceded that we are now inhabiting the bed of an antediluvian ocean.

"In a late publication by Mr. Lyell, which has come under my notice since the above was written, and which is a work full of information of the most important kind, with regard to natural secondary causes, which he considers sufficient to account for all the appearances on the surface of the earth, we find a calculation with respect to the quantity of mud lodged in the sea by the Ganges, which appears, as it is well calculated to do, to shake to its foundation the theory of the author; for it is obvious that it proves too much to suit his idea of millions of years, as the age of the world. After stating the calculations of Rennel, and of Major Colebrooke, with respect to the waters of the Ganges, which are calculated to contain one part in four of mud, Mr. Lyell continues;—  
'But, although we can readily believe the proportion of sediment in the waters of the Ganges to exceed that of any river in northern latitudes, we are somewhat staggered by the results to which we must arrive, if we compare the proportion of mud, as given by Rennel, with his computation of the quantity of water discharged, which latter is probably very correct. If it be true that the Ganges, in the flood-season, contains one part in four of mud, we shall then be obliged to suppose that there passes down, every four days, a quantity of mud, equal in volume to the water which is discharged in the course of twenty-four hours. If the mud be assumed to be equal to one half the specific gravity of granite, (it would, however, be more,) the weight of matter DAILY carried down in the flood-season, would be about equal to seventy-four times the weight of the great pyramid of Egypt. Even if it could be proved that the turbid waters of the Ganges contain one part in a HUNDRED of mud, which is possible, and which is affirmed to be the case in regard to the Rhine, we should be brought to the extraordinary conclusion, that there passes down, every day, into the Bay of Bengal, a mass more than equal in weight and bulk to the great pyramid.'—*Principles of Geology*, vol. i. p. 284. Let the candour of this very able author calculate this effect over the whole earth for 2000 years, and then consider it as having acted for one or two MILLIONS of years; and let him say which result bears the most just proportion to the secondary formations actually found to load the primitive surface of the earth." \*

In addition to this, we submit to Mr. Lyell that we are not justified in supposing that the results of volcanic and aqueous forces in one era being given, the results of any number of equal eras can be ascertained. Is there any law which maintains their equability?

But we rest our chief objection to this opinion on its irreconcilableness, as we have said, with Scriptural chronology. We know that many—and amongst them the learned divine and

\* The Geology of Scripture, by G. Fairholme, Esq., p. 107, note.

geologist to whom we have already *twice* referred—have suggested that we may regard the Mosaic days “not to have designated ordinary days of twenty-four hours, but periods of definite but considerable length: such a mode of extending the signification of this term not being unexampled in other parts of the sacred writings.”

To this we cannot accede. It would throw the most painful indefiniteness over the Mosaic history. Do the advocates of such an interpretation assign to the seventh day the same duration as to any one of the other days? They must, if they would avoid the most glaring inconsistency—an inconsistency which would as much shake our belief of the inspired statements, as any one of the most contradictory geological discoveries.

We feel equally opposed to a second construction of some theological writers—that the first verse of the book of Genesis simply records the creation of the unarranged chaotic *materiel* of the world, and then allows an indefinite intermediate period between it and the second verse, during which the crystallization of primitive and formation of secondary rocks might have taken place. We would prefer the successive worlds of geologists, in which, at least, we have the ornament of animated beings, to the cold and useless mass of a chaotic fermentation. What object could have been secured by such an arrangement? And besides, if God displayed his power by commanding beings into immediate existence, by instantly creating them in all the regular and *matured* possession of their different attributes, by introducing Adam, not as the infant, but the man—where the wisdom of breaking the analogy of conceiving our globe's birth to have been infantine, and tracing through an indefinite age its attainment of perfection?

Thus by a steady regard to the Mosaic history, we conclude that the interval between the period of the actual formation of this globe and the present, *could* not, *need* not, exceed our general chronology. And our admission that some species *have* become extinct, relieves us from any absurdity in regard to the absence of modern analogies with many fossilized remains.

It now remains for us to offer but a few remarks upon the bearing of the doctrine of absolute uniformity upon the miraculous interposition of Scripture. We think we are not unfair in arguing, that if we admit the one, we must reject the other. They are essentially opposed. As to the theory of miracles, it is quite sufficient for our present purpose to observe, that they were not the ordinary products of the laws of nature. They would not have taken place, but for some *moral*, not *natural*, reason. Unless Mr. Lyell can prove that the aqueous agency of the

deluge must have exerted itself as the legitimate sequence of a long train of natural antecedents, whether man had displayed moral deterioration or not: unless he can prove that the volcanic agency, which destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah, must have burst forth, whether their inhabitants had been guilty or not, he must admit them to have followed upon God's miraculous interposition. There was no *natural* necessity that such causes should have been brought into operation. Had Noah, a preacher of righteousness, succeeded in reforming the people, the fountains of the great deep would not have been broken up:—the existence of ten righteous in the cities of the plain, would have enchained the subterraneous fury of the eruption.

We have introduced these observations with a passage of Mr. Lyell's before us, which would seem, on comparison, to convict us of injustice. It will be well to offer his entire views upon the Mosaic deluge.

“They who have used the terms ante-diluvian and post-diluvian in the manner above adverted to, proceed on the assumption that there are clear and unequivocal marks of the passage of a general flood over all parts of the surface of the globe. It had long been a question among the learned, even before the commencement of geological researches, whether the deluge of the Scriptures was universal in reference to the whole surface of the globe, or only so with respect to that portion of it which was then inhabited by man. If the latter interpretation be admissible, the reader will have seen, in former parts of this work, that there are two classes of phenomena in the configuration of the earth's surface, which might enable us to account for such an event. First, extensive lakes elevated above the level of the ocean; secondly, large tracts of dry land depressed below that level. When there is an immense lake, having its surface, like Lake Superior, raised 600 feet above the level of the sea, the waters may be suddenly let loose by the rending or sinking down of the barrier during earthquakes, and hereby a region as extensive as the valley of the Mississippi, inhabited by a population of several millions, might be deluged. On the other hand, there may be a country placed beneath the mean level of the ocean, as we have shown to be the case with part of Asia, and such a region must be entirely laid under water, should the tract which separates it from the ocean be fissured or depressed to a certain depth. The great cavity of western Asia is 18,000 square leagues in area, and is occupied by a considerable population. The lowest parts, surrounding the Caspian Sea, are 300 feet below the level of the Euxine; here, therefore, the diluvial waters might overflow the summits of hills rising 300 feet above the level of the plain; and if depressions still more profound existed at any former time in Asia, the tops of still loftier mountains may have been covered by a flood.

“But it is undeniable, that the great majority of the older commentators have held the deluge, according to the brief account of the

event given by Moses, to have consisted of a rise of waters over *the whole earth*, by which the summits of the loftiest mountains on the globe were submerged.. Many have indulged in speculations concerning the instruments employed to bring about the grand cataclysm; and there has been a great division of opinion as to the effects which it might be expected to have produced on the surface of the earth. According to one school, of which De Luc in former times, and more recently Dr. Buckland, have been zealous and eloquent supporters, the passage of the flood worked a considerable alteration in the *external* configuration of our continents. By the last-mentioned writer the deluge is represented as a violent and transient rush of waters, which tore up the soil to a great depth, excavated valleys, gave rise to immense beds of shingle, carried fragments of rock and gravel from one point to another, and, during its advance and retreat, strewed the valleys, and even the tops of many hills, with alluvium.

“But we agree with Dr. Fleming, that in the narrative of Moses there are no terms employed that indicate the impetuous rushing of the waters, either as they rose or when they retreated, upon the restraining of the rain and the passing of a wind over the earth. On the contrary, the olive-branch, brought back by the dove, seems as clear an indication to us that the vegetation was not destroyed, as it was then to Noah that the dry land was about to appear.

“We have been led with great reluctance into this digression, in the hope of relieving the minds of some of our readers from groundless apprehension respecting the bearing of many of the views advocated in this work. They have been in the habit of regarding the diluvial theory above controverted as alone capable of affording an explanation of geological phenomena in accordance with Scripture, and they may have felt disapprobation at our attempt to prove, in a former chapter, that the minor volcanos on the flanks of Etna may, some of them, be more than 10,000 years old. How, they would immediately ask, could they have escaped the denuding force of a diluvial rush of waters? The same objection may have presented itself when we quoted, with so much respect, the opinion of a distinguished botanist, that some living specimens of the Baobab tree of Africa, or the Taxodium of Mexico, may be five thousand years old. Our readers may also have been astonished at the high antiquity assigned by us to the greater part of the European alluviums, and the many different ages to which we refer them, as they may have been taught to consider the whole as the result of one *recent* and *simultaneous* inundation. Lastly, they may have felt some disappointment at observing, that we attach no value whatever to the hypothesis of M. Elie de Beaumont, adopted by Professor Sedgwick, that the sudden elevation of mountain-chains ‘has been followed again and again by mighty waves desolating whole regions of the earth,’ a phenomenon which, according to the last-mentioned of these writers, has ‘taken away all anterior incredibility from the fact of a recent deluge.’

“For our own part, we have always considered the flood, if we are required to admit its universality in the strictest sense of the term, as

a preternatural event far beyond the reach of philosophical inquiry, whether as to the secondary causes employed to produce it, or the effects most likely to result from it. At the same time, it is evident that they who are desirous of pointing out the coincidence of geological phenomena with the occurrence of such a general catastrophe, must neglect no one of the circumstances enumerated in the Mosaic history, least of all so remarkable a fact as that the olive remained standing while the waters were abating."—vol. iii. pp. 270—274.

We are not unfair in taxing him with an attempt to explain away all the miraculous character of this event. In the first place, he supposes some *ordinary* phenomena which might account for it:—1. Extensive lakes, elevated above the level of the ocean; 2. Large tracts of dry land depressed below that level. And in the next place, he admits, though with ill-concealed reluctance, the *possibility* of its having been preternatural. Surely the sacred record affirms it to have been so extraordinary, that it never *can* occur again. "God has sworn that the waters of Noah should no more go over the earth." No natural causes could produce it. Should Mr. Lyell, however, allow it to be *preternatural*, there follows a fatal exception to his entire theory.

It may be desirable, whilst upon this interesting portion, to quote a very satisfactory passage from Professor Buckland. "The grand fact of *an universal deluge* at no very remote period, is proved on grounds so decisive and incontrovertible, that had we not heard of such an event from Scripture, or any other authority, geology of itself must have called in the assistance of some such catastrophe, to explain the phenomena of diluvian action, which are universally presented to us, and which are unintelligible without recourse to a deluge exerting its ravages at a period not more ancient than that announced in the Book of Genesis." It is highly satisfactory to find the following strong statement on this subject, published by one who deservedly ranks in the very first class of natural observers, and in the very centre of continental philosophy. "It may be seen," says Cuvier, "that nature every where distinctly informs us that the commencement of the present order of things cannot be dated at a very remote period; and it is remarkable that mankind every where speak the same language with nature." And in another place he adds, "I am of opinion with M. Deluc and M. Dolomieu, that, if there is any circumstance thoroughly established in geology, it is, that the crust of our globe has been subjected to a great and sudden revolution, the epoch of which cannot be dated much farther back than five or six thousand years ago; and that this revolution had buried all the countries which were

before inhabited by men and by the other animals that are now best known."

We must now draw our remarks to a conclusion. It has been with considerable pain that we have been compelled to reject any of Mr. Lyell's sentiments, for the reason that we deem them unscriptural. And we beg our readers to recollect the very general grounds on which we have done it. Setting aside his doctrine of uniformity, which has been a Procrustes' bed, to which he has unrelentingly adapted all his minor views, a more philosophical, patiently inductive chain of reasoning we have rarely met with. In future editions of his work, however, we would suggest the propriety of a more lucid outline of his method, as there is some obscurity in this particular.

Mr. Lyell, in his philosophic spirit, very closely resembles the illustrious Hutton; he has the same love of truth for its own sake—the same superiority to the gross and perishable advantages of transitory enjoyment. Notwithstanding our past disagreement with him, we shall follow his future inquiries with the most friendly interest, and shall hail with pleasure any additional volume from his pen.

---

ART. VI.—*Memoirs of the Life and Correspondence of the Rev. Christian Frederick Swartz: to which is prefixed a Sketch of the History of Christianity in India.* By Hugh Pearson, D.D. M.R.A.S. Dean of Salisbury. London: J. Hatchard and Son. 2 vols. 8vo. 1834.

WE are told by his biographer that Swartz,—that greatest of Christian Missionaries since the days of the Apostles,—depre-  
cated posthumous praise. This, perhaps, is by no means surprising in him, or in any man whose thoughts were, like his, intently and constantly fixed upon the *honour which cometh of God only*. But it would be quite impossible for those who come after him to act up to the spirit of his self-denying modesty, otherwise than by total abstinence from any recital of his labours. The simplest biography of him unavoidably involves such commendation, as casts into the shade most other Christian excellence. And such an account of his services is a debt most righteously due to the Church of God; or rather, to the mercy and the grace of God, which raised up so perfect a model of the Missionary character. To consider his *deprecation* as altogether sacred and inviolable, would, therefore, be no less than to defraud the world, and to dishonour Him who came to redeem the world. It would be a



burning disgrace to the Christian name, if the Church were left without as full and distinct a memorial as could be prepared, of what the Lord has done for his own cause, almost by the instrumentality of a single man.

It is somewhat surprising that this work has never been achieved before. Six and thirty years have now elapsed since this eminent minister of Christ entered into rest: and we have now, for the first time, before us, any thing like a digested narrative of his labours, from his first entrance on the duties of a Missionary in 1750, to the day of his death in 1798, a period of nearly half a century! The task, however, has frequently been in contemplation. The amiable and admirable Gerické—the venerable Kohlhoff, the coadjutor and successor of Swartz—the zealous and munificent Buchanan—the excellent Missionary Horst, each of them entertained the design. The execution of it, however, has, after all, been reserved for Dr. Pearson: and we are now to give some account of the result of his inquiries.

The materials of his work have been rather more scanty than could be desired. The great Missionary left no collection of private papers. His official communications to the venerable Society which employed him, were by no means very frequent or copious; and, of these, the most important parts are dispersed throughout the Society's Reports. Some original letters and notices, indeed, have been diligently gleaned from various other quarters; partly from Germany, partly from the fellow-labourers of Swartz, partly from several of his personal friends and correspondents, partly from the Honourable John Sullivan who was the resident at Tanjore in 1784 and 1785, partly from Colonel Blackburne, who filled the same station for many years immediately subsequent to the death of Swartz, and partly from the records of the Indian government in this country. Dr. P. would gladly have enriched his collection from the correspondence of John Hudleston, Esq., with the venerable Missionary. This gentleman was a very valuable servant of the company, and during many years a member of the honourable Court of Directors. His private letters would probably have illustrated that interesting period of Swartz's life, which connected him with Serfogee, the Rajah of Tanjore. But Dr. Pearson regrets that he has been unable to obtain these papers from Mr. Hudleston's successor. From such resources, however, as he has been able to command, he has compiled a simple, unambitious, but very interesting narrative, which exhibits the Apostolic man more distinctly to our perceptions, than any former notice which has ever been laid before the public. There may possibly be some persons, to whom certain portions of the recital may appear somewhat monotonous.



The employments, the conversations, the correspondence, of a man whose thoughts were incessantly fixed on *the one thing needful*, can scarcely be expected to supply that variety of feverish excitement, which is produced by the representation of worldly adventure and vicissitude. But the ear which is accustomed to the solemn and majestic harmonies of Divine Truth, will experience no weariness from their repetition. The theme of man's redemption can scarcely pall upon the spiritual sense of any one who habitually remembers that, simple as it may be, it is a theme which eternity itself cannot exhaust. We will not, indeed, undertake to pronounce that the impatience and fastidiousness of that important personage, *the general reader*, might not have been better consulted by a process of retrenchment. But, nevertheless, in a case like this, where what has been preserved to us is, after all, little and precious—*ὀλίγον τε φίλον τε*—we confess that we greatly prefer a religious regard for every fragment, to the rejection of a single sentence which may gratify the ear of piety.

It is a most remarkable circumstance that the real character of Swartz was not properly understood even by Bishop Heber, before he went to India. "I used to suspect," he says, "that with many admirable qualities, there was too great a mixture of intrigue in his character; that he was too much of a political prophet; and that the veneration which the heathen paid him, and still pay him, and which almost regards him as a superior being, putting crowns and burning lights before his statue, was purchased by some unwarrantable compromise with their prejudices." He adds, however, immediately, "I find I was quite mistaken. He was really one of the most active and fearless, as he was one of the most successful of missionaries who have appeared since the Apostles. To say that he was disinterested in regard to money, is nothing. He was perfectly regardless of power; and renown never seemed to affect him, *even so far as to affect an outward shew of humility*. His temper was perfectly simple, open, and cheerful: and in his political negotiations (employments which he never sought for, but which fell in his way), he never pretended to impartiality, but acted as the avowed, though the successful and judicious agent, of the orphan prince entrusted to his care; and from attempting whose conversion to Christianity, he seems to have abstained, from a feeling of honour. His other converts were between six and seven thousand; besides those whom his predecessors and companions in the cause had brought over."\* Now, if a man like Bishop Heber carried out with him to India such mistaken prepossessions as he has here confessed and retracted, it is by no means impossible that there may be

persons, even at this day, labouring under similar misapprehensions. And if this should be so, we urgently recommend all such persons to do the memory of Swartz the very easy justice of looking through these two volumes. They may, if they please, pass over those portions, which threaten them with lassitude from the iteration of the same sentiments. Nay, they may, if their stock of patience should run short, confine their attention to those parts of his biography which represent him in unwilling contact with secular interests and political transactions. The most cursory perusal cannot fail to disabuse them for ever of their unworthy suspicions. They will rise from their task with a full conviction that the heavens never looked upon a man more free from guile, or duplicity, or artifice of any kind. It is irresistibly evident that he no more thought of any intricate or circuitous path to his object, than he thought of swindling or picking pockets. There never was a character of more entire simplicity and *directness*. He seems to have walked throughout his life in a calm, serene abstraction from all worldly motives. If we are to judge purely by what is known of him, it would seem scarcely enough to say that he struggled successfully against them, for he appears like one who was placed altogether beyond the reach of their disturbing power. To all fear, except the fear of God, he was manifestly a stranger; and even the fear of God was merged and swallowed up in love. His courage was that of a man who is conscious that he is living in a world where no evil worth a thought could possibly happen to him, except the evil of falling into wilful and impenitent sin; and against this evil he felt a constant security in the promises of divine mercy and protection. If there is any thing in the narrative of his life which can tend to impair the interest of it in the estimation of the world, it is the total absence of any thing which looks like human infirmity. We are literally in possession of nothing which tends to fix the slightest or minutest blot upon his name. His virtue, so far as is recorded, was (if we may so apply the words) *without spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing*. The nearest approach, which we have been able to detect, even to a momentary commotion of his temper, was occasioned by what he conceived to be a most pernicious abandonment of saving doctrine. He had received from some friend a volume of Sermons by Dr. Price, the celebrated Dissenting Minister. The following is the language in which he speaks of them; "Dr. Price's book of Sermons was sent to me. I perused them, *was shocked at the doctrine, cut the book to pieces, and buried it*. They destroy the foundation of happiness, and true holiness. What can they build? Paul was another master builder, who knew of no other foundation than Jesus Christ." (vol. ii. p. 255.)

This may be thought by some to look like angry vehemence of spirit. But, even so—we suspect it was anger of which an Apostle would hardly have been ashamed. At all events, it spent itself only on the impassive volume; and, so far, it resembles the curse pronounced upon the barren fig-tree. If any, however, should feel unable to forgive this holy man for the pureness of his memory from all taint of imputation, they may console themselves with the reflection that he could not have been altogether faultless; although, as his biographer observes, “whatever may have been his failings and infirmities, they were known only to himself and his God.”

With regard to the intellectual powers of Swartz, it will be remarked by those who consult these memoirs, that they were not of an order which inspires, at once, admiration and despair. Had his life been devoted merely to literature, it is probable that he might never have been able to establish for himself a very commanding reputation. His abilities were eminently practical. The talents which he possessed, if separately contemplated, were not of a much more powerful or exalted cast than we find very frequently exemplified among the sons of men. But in their combination they were admirable. They produced together that sort of harmony which indicates what is usually called a *sound mind*. There was no undue predominance of any one capacity: none of that irregular movement which is the result of sluggishness in one faculty, and excess of activity in another. It is scarcely to be supposed that any one whose heart was so warm should be destitute of the imaginative power. But, if he possessed it, it was in strict subordination to more solid and applicable qualities. His mind never wasted itself in visionary excursions: or if it ever wandered beyond the sphere of the duties which lay before him, it was to expatiate in the regions where the spirits of the blessed shall behold the face of God. His mental endowments, in short, were precisely such as signally to entitle him to the praise of a wise man. But the grand secret of his usefulness, his influence, and his renown, was, that he drew his resources from the fountain of all sufficiency, even from *Christ, the power of God, and the wisdom of God*.

The birth-place of Swartz was the small Prussian Town of Sonnenburg. He was born in October 1726. His parents were respectable. His mother eminently pious. On her death-bed she declared to her husband, and the pastor who attended her, that she had dedicated her son to the Lord, and begged that he might be educated for the ministry. At the age of eight years he was sent to the town Grammar School. His impressions during childhood appear to have been serious. It was his custom, even

then, to retire into solitude, and pour forth his heart before God. If he was ever conscious of acting wrong, he could never regain his peace of mind till he had implored the Divine forgiveness. His religious feelings, however, languished for a time; and when he was removed to Custrin, in order to his preparation for the University, he fell into thoughtless company, by which his principles were considerably shaken. In 1746, he removed to Halle, where his devotional habits experienced a revival. It was here that he was induced to turn his attention to the study of the Tamul language, with a view to employment in correcting the press of a Tamul edition of the Bible, and a Tract in the same tongue, under the superintendence of the late Missionary Schultz. While he was thus engaged, he heard of inquiries for new Missionaries to India. He immediately formed a resolution to offer himself for that important destination. Having obtained his father's consent, his first step was to divide his patrimony among his brothers and sisters. His next was, to refuse an advantageous opportunity of entering the ministry at home. On the 8th of August 1749, he set out for Copenhagen for the purpose of receiving holy orders. On the 8th of the following December, he arrived in London, where he and his two reverend brethren, Poltzenhagen and Hutteman, remained six weeks, learning the English language, and making preparations for their voyage. In January, 1750, he and his companions embarked for India, as Missionaries engaged by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. On the 16th of July following he reached India, and by the 30th was settled at Tranquebar. Such was his diligence, that in less than four months he qualified himself to preach in Tamul. He delivered his first sermon in that language on the 23d of November, 1750, in Ziegenbald's Church. From this period commenced that wonderful course of labour, which continued without intermission for upwards of eight and forty years; and which have furnished the world with a perfect pattern of missionary zeal and faithfulness.

Of course, it is utterly impossible for us to conduct our readers throughout the whole progress of these sustained exertions. We can do no more than endeavour to select such particulars as may best illustrate the methods by which, under the blessing and guidance of the Eternal Spirit, he made the south of India the principal scene of the triumphs of the Gospel in our Asiatic Empire.

The first object of attention, then, is the mode he adopted for winning over the slaves of a stupid, frivolous and sensual superstition to the purity and the simplicity which is in Christ. With reference to this point, we find that Swartz was accustomed to

make daily excursions both among the Christians and unconverted natives, generally in company with one of the elder brethren. At that time there were seven or eight missionaries at Tranquebar. Of these, four or five occasionally went out, attended by one or both of the country priests; each missionary being followed by a catechist, or assistant, and some of the school-boys of the first class. They divided themselves, either singly, or in parties of two, among the neighbouring towns and villages, conversing with the natives, endeavouring to convince them of their error, and to persuade them to embrace the religion of the gospel. This was a regular and stated proceeding. In addition to this, every individual belonging to the mission was always on the watch for every promising occasion of uttering a word in season to persons with whom they might be casually brought into contact. In this peculiar line of duty Swartz appears to have been without a rival. His imperturbable temper—his winning benevolence—his perfect self-possession—his simple and heavenly-minded wisdom—his entire mastery of all the most effective topics, and producible arguments, connected with the subject—his felicity of application to the prevailing habits of thought and feeling among the natives—and, lastly, (as his residence among them became prolonged), his consummate and minute acquaintance with the follies and absurdities of their system,—all these perfections were so combined in him, as to “give the world assurance of a man” who seemed to be set apart, as it were from his mother’s womb, to do the work of an evangelist. One is tempted, by the contemplation of these endowments, to imagine what the effect must be, if men like him were scattered by hundreds and by thousands over the face of Hindostan. With the actual success of this one man before our eyes, we cannot well conceive how the corrupt and “dark idolatries” of the land could long maintain their ground before a succession of such preachers. That God can, by the breath of his mouth, raise up such men in troops and multitudes, cannot of course be the subject of doubt. And if the dominion of Christ is eventually to prevail through an outpouring of the Spirit of God, we have only to figure to ourselves his mighty operation in overshadowing the regions of idolatry by a cloud of such witnesses as Swartz. The process might, in a certain sense, be deemed miraculous. But it would be an economy of miracles, which would appeal directly to the hearts, and the consciences, and the understandings of men. And if this be so, how can we better acquit ourselves of our responsibility towards the degraded millions of our eastern empire, than by labouring, humbly and instrumentally, in conformity to the plan by which

the providence of God may hereafter condescend to work. If the precept "Go, preach the gospel to every nation under heaven," were written as in flame upon the hearts of Englishmen, can we doubt that the Lord of the Harvest would answer their prayers, by raising up an abundance of labourers like unto the wise and apostolic Swartz.

Another remarkable feature in the proceedings of Swartz and his associates, was their scrupulous care in the preparation of those whom they had converted from idolatry, for the Christian Sacrament of Baptism. This preparation was regularly carried on at stated periods of the year. Several of the missionaries were occasionally employed with different parties of the natives at the same time. No less than twenty of such preparatory lectures and instructions were given in the course of the year 1751. This department of labour was generally committed to the junior missionaries, whenever they were sufficiently conversant with the native language. The exercise was admirably fitted to make those engaged in it familiar with their work; while the seniors were thus left more at leisure, for the purposes of correspondence, and for other arduous duties of their calling. It is further to be observed, that the care of the missionaries was not confined to the object of ascertaining the proficiency of the catechumens in religious knowledge. It was extended to their personal habits and dispositions. If their apprehension was slow, or their sincerity doubtful, they were put off to the next season of preparation. The period of probation for baptism was sometimes extended for several months, in order that the missionaries might have a better opportunity of observing the moral character of the converts, and also of informing themselves respecting the previous conduct of those candidates who came to them from distant places. Such exemplary caution would, of course, deprive the labourers of all chance of astonishing the world by such prodigious drafts of proselytes as are said to have filled the nets of De Nobili or Xavier. But the whole scheme of proceeding is such as to demolish, at once, the silly and malignant calumnies which have frequently been circulated in this country, relative to the efforts of our Christian brethren for evangelizing India. We have been frequently, and very confidently, assured, that the Christian congregations are, in reality, nothing more than the sweepings and offscourings of Indian society! That the utmost vigilance of their instructors and guardians should be insufficient for the formation of a community, made up of perfect and consistent Christians, may be all very true. It is just nothing more than might reasonably be anticipated by any but the most visionary enthusiasts. But that



men like Swartz and his fellow-labourers should be such fools or knaves, as to open a vile sanctuary for despicable and profligate outcasts, is, on the face of it, absolutely incredible. They who can deliberately affirm this, must be in the very gall of bitterness. And they who have been imposed upon by such fictions, have only to consider the spirit of sobriety and watchfulness which presided over the admission of the converts into the church of Christ. If this should fail to satisfy them, we really know not what can be said, but that their judgment must be secretly perverted by the very wantonness of scepticism—in a word, by an *evil heart of unbelief*.

With reference to this subject, we may, in this place, very properly appeal to the triumphant, though calm and temperate, vindication, by which Swartz himself, more than thirty years afterwards, poured confusion upon this miserable brood of slanders. In 1793, a resolution was passed by a Committee of the House of Commons, to the effect, that it was the bounden duty of the British Legislature to provide for the religious and moral improvement of the Hindoos. In the course of the debate on this subject, Sir Montgomery Campbell (who had held an official situation at Madras) gave his decided vote against the proposition, and reprobated the notion of converting the natives.

"It is true," he is reported to have said, "that missionaries have made proselytes of the Pariahs; but they were the lowest order of the people, and had even degraded the religion they professed to embrace. Mr. Swartz, whose character was held so deservedly high, could not have any reason to boast of the purity of his followers: *they were proverbial for their profligacy*. An instance occurred to his recollection perfectly in point. Mr. Swartz had been preaching for many hours to this caste of proselytes on the heinousness of theft, and, in the heat of his discourse had taken off his stock; when that and his gold buckle were stolen by one of his virtuous and enlightened congregation. In such a description of natives did the doctrine of the missionaries operate. Men of high caste would spurn at the idea of changing the religion of their ancestors."

Now let us turn from this precious version of the incident in question, to the fact, as stated by Swartz in a letter to the secretary of the Society.

"About seventeen years ago, when I resided at Trichinopoly, I visited the congregation at Tanjore. In my road, I arrived very early at a village inhabited by collaries (regular bred thieves.). . . . When I arrived at one of these villages, called Pudaloor, I took off my stock, putting it upon a sand-bank. Advancing a little, to look out for the man who carried my linen clothes, I was regardless of my stock; at which time some thievish boys carried it away. When the inhabitants heard of



the theft, they desired me to confine all the boys, and to punish them as severely as I pleased. But I refused to do that, not thinking that the trifle which I had lost was worth so much trouble. That such boys, whose fathers are professed thieves, should commit a theft, can be no matter of wonder. All the inhabitants of that village are heathens: *not one Christian family was found therein*. Many of our gentlemen, travelling through that village, have been robbed. The trifle of a buckle, therefore, I did not lose by a Christian, as Mr. M. Campbell will have it, but by heathen boys. Neither did I preach at that time. Mr. C. says that I preached two hours. I did not so much as converse with any man. This poor story, totally misrepresented, is alleged by Mr. C. to prove the profligacy of Christians, whom he called, with a sneer, *virtuous and enlightened people*. If he has no better proof, his conclusion is built upon a bad foundation, and I shall not admire his logic: truth is against him. Neither is it true, that the best part of those people who have been instructed, are pariahs. Had Mr. C. visited, even once, our church, he would have observed, that *more than two thirds were of the higher caste: and so it is at Tranquebar and Vepery*.—vol. ii. pp. 288—290.

Upon seeing this victorious statement, Mr. M. Campbell thought fit to write an apology to Swartz; assuring him that his speech had been erroneously reported—and so forth. In the mean time, however, the speech, or the report of it, had gone abroad throughout the empire; and had, doubtless, established, to the satisfaction of the public, that the houses of prayer of the Hindoo Christians were little better than dens of thieves!

We cannot resist this opportunity of laying before our readers the remainder of Swartz's letter. It will form rather a long extract, but a very valuable one. It displays, in its perfection, the meekness of wisdom. It shows the prodigious ascendancy which Swartz had acquired, purely by the force of Christian integrity, over the minds of the natives of every class. And, lastly, it will enable the reader to estimate rightly the monstrous misrepresentations with which the missionary cause was then assailed. We hold that to those who may never have seen it before, this one document is, of itself, well worth the whole price of these two volumes.

"Our intention," continues Swartz, "is not to boast: but this I may safely say, that many of those who have been instructed, have left this world with comfort, and with a well-grounded hope of everlasting life. That some of those who have been instructed and baptized have abused the benefit of instruction, is certain. But all sincere servants of God, nay, even the apostles, have experienced this grief.

"It is asserted, that a missionary is a disgrace to any country. Lord Macartney, and the late General Coote, would have entertained a very different opinion. They and many other gentlemen know and acknow-

ledge, that the missionaries have been beneficial to government, and a comfort to the country. This I am able to prove in the strongest manner. Many gentlemen, who live now in England and in this country would corroborate my assertion.

“ That the Rev. Mr. Gerické has been of eminent service at Cuddalore, every gentleman, who was at that place when the war broke out, knows. He was the instrument, in the hands of Providence, by which Cuddalore was saved from plunder and bloodshed. He saved many gentlemen from becoming prisoners to Hyder, which Lord Macartney kindly acknowledged.

“ When Negapatam, that rich and populous city, fell into the deepest poverty, by the unavoidable consequences of war, Mr. Gerické behaved like a father to the distressed inhabitants. He forgot that he had a family to provide for. Many impoverished families were supported by him; so that when I, a few months ago, preached and administered the sacrament in that place, I saw many who owed their own and their children's lives to his disinterested care. Surely this, my friend, could not be called a disgrace to that place. When the honourable Society ordered him to attend the congregation at Madras, all lamented his departure. And at Madras, he is esteemed by the governor, and many other gentlemen, to this day.

“ It is a most disagreeable task to speak of one's self. However, I hope that the honourable Society will not look upon some observations which I am about to make, as a vain and sinful boasting, but rather as a necessary self-defence. Neither the missionaries, nor any of the Christians, have hurt the welfare of the country.

“ In the course of the late war, the fort of Tanjore was in a very critical condition. A powerful enemy was near; the people in the fort numerous; and not provisions even for the garrison. There was grain enough in the country, but we had no bullocks to bring it into the fort. When the country people formerly brought paddy into the fort, the rapacious dubashes deprived them of their due pay. Hence, all confidence was lost; so that the inhabitants drove away their cattle, refusing to assist the fort. The late rajah ordered, nay, entreated the people, by his managers, to come and help us; but all was in vain.

“ At last, the rajah said to one of our principal gentlemen,—*We all, you and I, have lost our credit; let us try whether the inhabitants will trust Mr. Swartz.* Accordingly he sent me a blank paper, empowering me to make a proper agreement with the people. There was no time for hesitation. The sepoys fell down as dead people, being emaciated with hunger. Our streets were lined with dead corpses every morning. Our condition was deplorable. I sent, therefore, letters every where round about, promising to pay every one with my own hands; and to indemnify them for the loss of every bullock which might be taken by the enemy. In one or two days, I got above a thousand oxen, and sent one of our catechists and other Christians into the country. They went at the risk of their lives, made all possible haste, and brought into the fort, in a very short time, eighty thousand kalams. By this means the fort was saved. When all was over, I paid the people, (even with

some money which belonged to others,) made them a small present, and sent them home.

"The next year, when Colonel Braithwaite, with his whole detachment, was made prisoner, Major Alcock commanded this fort, and behaved very kindly to the poor starving people. We were then a second time in the same miserable condition. The enemy always invaded the country when the harvest was nigh at hand. I was again desired to try my former expedient, and succeeded. The people, knowing that they were not to be deprived of their pay, came with their cattle. But now the danger was greater, as the enemy was very near. The Christians conducted the inhabitants to proper places, surely with no small danger of losing their lives. *Accordingly they wept, and went, and supplied the fort with grain.* When the people were paid, I strictly inquired whether any of the Christians had taken from them a present. They all said, 'No, no! As we were regularly paid, we offered to your catechist a cloth of small value, but he absolutely refused it.'

"But Mr. M. Campbell says, that the Christians are profligate to a proverb. If he were near me, I would explain to him who are the profligate people who drain the country. When a dubash, in the space of ten or fifteen years, scrapes together two, three, or four lacks of pagodas, is not this extortion a high degree of profligacy? Nay, government was obliged to send an order that three of those Gentoo dubashes should quit the Tanjore country. The enormous crimes committed by them filled the country with complaints; but I have no mind to enumerate them.

"It is asserted, that the inhabitants of the country would suffer by missionaries. If they are sincere Christians, it is impossible that the inhabitants should suffer any damage by them; if they are not what they profess to be, they ought to be dismissed.

"When Sir Archibald Campbell was governor, and Mr. M. Campbell his private secretary, the inhabitants of Tanjore were so miserably oppressed by the manager and the Madras dubashes, that they quitted the country. Of course, all cultivation ceased. In the month of June it should commence; but nothing was done, even at the beginning of September. Every one dreaded the calamity of a famine. I entreated the rajah to remove that shameful oppression, and to recall the inhabitants. He sent them word that justice should be done to them; but they disbelieved his promises. He then desired *me* to write to them, and to assure them, that he, at my intercession, would show kindness to them. I did so. All immediately returned; and first of all, the kallar (or, as they are commonly called, collaries,) believed my word; so that seven thousand men came back on one day. The other inhabitants followed their example. When I exhorted them to exert themselves to the utmost, because the time for cultivation was almost lost, they replied in the following manner:—'*As you have showed kindness to us, you shall not have reason to repent of it: we intend to work night and day, to show our regard for you.*' Sir Archibald Campbell was happy when he heard of it; and we had the satisfaction of having a better crop than the preceding year.

"As there was hardly any administration of justice, I begged and

entreated the rajah to establish it in his country. 'Well,' said he, 'let me know wherein my people are oppressed.' I did so. He immediately consented to my proposal, and told his manager, that he should feel his indignation, if the oppression did not cease immediately. But as he soon died, he did not see the execution.

"When the present rajah began his reign, I put Sir Archibald Campbell in mind of that necessary point. He desired me to make a plan for a court of justice; which I did: but it was soon neglected by the servants of the rajah, who commonly sold justice to the best bidder.

"When the honourable Company took possession of the country during the war, the plan for introducing justice was re-assumed, by which many people were made happy. But when it was restored to the rajah, the former irregularities took place.

"During the assumption, government desired me to assist the gentlemen collectors. The district towards the west of Tanjore had been very much neglected, so that the water-courses had not been cleansed for the last fifteen years. I proposed that the collector should advance five hundred pagodas to cleanse them. He consented, if I would inspect the business. The work was begun and finished, being superintended by Christians. All that part of the country rejoiced in getting one hundred thousand kalams more than before. The inhabitants confessed that, instead of one kalam, they now reaped four.

"No native has suffered by Christians; none has complained of it. On the contrary, one of the richest inhabitants said to me, 'Sir, if you send a person to us, send us one who has learned all your ten commandments.' For he and many hundred natives had been present when I explained the Christian doctrine to heathen and Christians.

"The inhabitants dread the conduct of a Madras dubash. These people lend money to the rajah, at an exorbitant interest, and then are permitted to collect their money and interest in an appointed district. It is needless to mention the consequences.

"When the collaries committed great outrages, in their plundering expeditions, sepoys were sent out to adjust matters; but it had no effect. Government desired me to inquire into the thievish business. I therefore sent letters to the head collaries. They appeared. We found out, in some degree, how much the Tanjore, and Tondimans, and the nabobs' collaries, had stolen; and we insisted upon restoration, which was done accordingly. At last, all gave it in writing, that they would steal no more. This promise they kept very well for eight months, and then they began their old work; however, not as before. Had that inspection over their conduct been continued, they might have been made useful people. I insisted upon their cultivating their fields, which they readily did. But if the demands become exorbitant, they have no resource, as they think, but of plundering.

"At length, some of the thievish collaries desired to be instructed. I said, 'I am obliged to instruct you; but I am afraid you will prove very bad Christians.' Their promises were fair. I instructed them; and when they had a tolerable knowledge, I baptized them. I then

exhorted them to steal no more, but to work industriously. After that I visited them, and, having examined their knowledge, I desired to see their work. I observed with pleasure that their fields were excellently cultivated. 'Now,' said I, 'one thing remains to be done. You must pay your tribute readily, and not wait till it is exacted by military force;' which, otherwise, is their custom. Soon after that, I found that they had paid off their tribute exactly. The only complaint against those Christian collaries was that they refused to go upon plundering expeditions, as they had done before.

"Now, I am well aware that some will accuse me of having boasted. I confess the charge willingly, but lay all the blame upon those who have constrained me to commit that folly. I might have enlarged my account; but, fearing that some characters would have suffered by it, I stop here. One thing, however, I affirm, before God and man, **THAT IF CHRISTIANITY, IN ITS PLAIN AND UNDISGUISED FORM, WERE PROPERLY PROMOTED, THE COUNTRY WOULD NOT SUFFER, BUT BE BENEFITTED BY IT.**

"If Christians were employed in some important offices, they should, if they misbehaved, be doubly punished; but to reject them entirely, is not right, and discourageth.

"The glorious God and our blessed Redeemer commanded his apostles to preach the gospel to all nations. The knowledge of God, of his divine perfections, and of his mercy to mankind, may be abused; but there is no other method of reclaiming men, than by instructing them well. To hope that the heathens will lead a good life without the knowledge of God, is a chimera.

"The praise bestowed on the heathens of this country by many of our historians, is refuted by a close (I might almost say, a superficial) inspection of their lives. Many historical works are more like a romance than history. Many gentlemen here are astonished how some historians have prostituted their talents by writing fables.

"I am now on the brink of eternity; but to this moment I declare that I do not repent of having spent forty three years here in the service of my divine Master. Who knows but God may remove some of the great obstacles to the propagation of the gospel? Should a reformation take place amongst the Europeans, it would no doubt be the greatest blessing to the country.

"These observations I beg leave to lay before the honourable Society, with my humble thanks for all their benefits bestowed on this work, and sincere wishes that their pious and generous endeavours to disseminate the knowledge of God and of Jesus Christ may be beneficial to many thousands.

"I am sincerely, Reverend and dear Sir,

"Your affectionate brother and humble servant,

vol. ii. pp. 290—301.

"C. F. SWARTZ."

It is almost needless to repeat here, that among the principal circumstances which established the commanding reputation of Swartz, was the unimpeachable purity of his life. There was

not, in his composition, a single element of fanatical austerity. But, nevertheless, his own personal habits were of such extreme simplicity, as to invest him with a character of the highest sanctity, especially in the eyes of those who adopted, or who admired the ascetic life. He literally *laid aside every weight, that he might run with patience and alacrity, the race that was set before him.* In the first place, it is clear that when once his hand was on the plough, he never looked back. He evidently left his country without the slightest hope or intention to return. He had a heart overflowing with the kindest affections: and yet he devoted himself to a life of celibacy. This course of self-denial relieved him from the galling load of domestic cares and responsibilities; and it moreover enabled him to carry his contempt for wealth to a length, which alone was sufficient to secure for him the honours of a saint. He no more dreamed of accumulating money for himself, than he thought of accumulating hats, or coats, or trowsers. In his estimation, the faithless mammon was but a drudge, to be employed in the service of charity and holiness. His only riches were his converts: and whenever he sent forth another catechist, to administer to the spiritual wants of a distant flock, he despatched him with infinitely more joy and pride of heart, than if he had been sending a steward to collect the rents and profits of some new and flourishing possession. The effect was, an universal confidence in his entire disinterestedness and singleness of purpose; and this proved a magazine of strength to him, in the prosecution of his labours. It gave him access to all ranks and conditions of men. That man, they thought, must indeed be holy, who, without the slightest appearance of effort or ostentation, was elevated above the motives and the passions which mastered, and often degraded, the rest of mankind. Hindoo and Mussulman, Prince and Brahmin, all were ready for familiar converse with the venerable, self-denying, and heavenly-minded Frank. Though his faith was different from their own, he evidently belonged to an order, which men of every faith are unable to look upon without reverence and admiration. He was manifestly one who had overcome the world.

But this is not all. It has frequently been the subject of remark, even among intelligent and religious Europeans, resident in India, that our missionaries have not always been sufficiently attentive to the prejudices of the Hindoos. In this respect, the conduct of Swartz appears to have been beyond all praise. He seems to have discerned the precise line between unworthy compromise of the truth, and abrupt assault upon falsehood. He never forbore to declare the whole counsel of God; he suffered no oppor-



tunity to escape, of warning the heathen that they should turn from idols, to serve Him who is the Father of all Spirits. He never disguised or modified the unpalatable doctrine of man's degeneracy and corruption. But yet this was all done with so much patience, with so much kindness, with such a mastery in the art of *speaking the truth in love*, that there is not an instance known or recorded, of any heathen leaving his presence with a feeling of personal irritation or offence. Many, doubtless, have retired with emotions of compunction and of shame. But this disturbance was never connected with any thing like displeasure against the faithful monitor. They had experienced that the truth had searched them; but they were without the slightest touch of resentment towards the lips which uttered it. Such was the fidelity, and such the skill, with which he set forth *the words of eternal life*, that even Brahmins were perpetually heard to confess, that his sayings were unrebukable. Yes, the very dealers in priestcraft, the earthly gods themselves, often avowed, that nothing but inveterate sensuality and avarice could resist his doctrine. They felt, and they acknowledged, that the Christian law was holy, and just, and good. But they also scraped not to allow, that there was a law in their members which warred against it, and kept them in captivity to the law of sin. If they did not tremble when they heard of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come, they at least listened with patience and with courtesy. And this they never would have done, if the preacher had commenced with rude, sarcastic, unfeeling aggression upon opinions and practices which had been handed down, through immemorial time, from generation to generation. And the consequence of all this was, that even when the Gospel failed to seize upon their heart, and to disarm the *strong man* within, it still secured attention, and respect, and honour. And this was one important step towards obtaining a more free course for the word of God, among those hearts who were simpler, and who were less formidably entangled in the snares of worldly pleasure and ambition.

One or two instances may be here recorded of the judgment and address with which Swartz was in the habit of dealing with the prejudices of the natives. Among those prejudices, that of *caste* is notoriously the most difficult to encounter. The following extract will show with what wisdom, and with what success, he contrived to soften the collision which this institution had a tendency to produce even in Christian congregations:—

“ ‘Concerning the question about castes,’ he observes, ‘both at Tranquebar and here, our congregations consist of nearly an equal number of the higher and the lower.’ He then refers particularly to



the difficulty which naturally arose as to the intercourse between natives of different castes, even after their conversion to that divine religion, which, while it invariably recognizes the distinctions of rank in civil society, teaches that all are brethren, as the children of the same common father, and the disciples of the same meek and lowly Saviour. 'Here,' he continues, 'the men and women of the higher caste, sit on one side of the church, and on the other, those of the lower.'

" 'I have carefully avoided all unnecessary restraint, and thus have met with fewer difficulties. Even at the administration of the sacrament, sometimes one or other of the lower caste has first approached to receive it, without producing any unpleasant sensation. Should you visit our church on a Sunday, you would observe with surprise the clean appearance of the lower caste, so that one might often take them for the higher. What renders them peculiarly obnoxious, is their feeding upon dead cattle. I have always expressed the utmost abhorrence of such a custom, and positively declared that I would not allow it; and, accordingly, I hardly know any instance of it here. The country priests and catechists generally belong to one of the higher castes. The catechist Gabriel is, indeed, of the lower; but notwithstanding this, he converses freely with people of a higher class, as he pays particular attention to cleanliness in his dress. In the interior of the country, such intercourse is certainly not so easy. I was lately invited to the house of a heathen of the higher caste, when the pariah catechist came to me. I called to him, 'Stop; I will come to you;' the suttirer, that is, the people of the higher caste, have not yet learned to be humble: they are proud sinners yet—we must bear with them. This they were not willing to admit, and accordingly showed kindness to the catechist. In another place, in the house of a heathen, many people assembled, whom I catechised and prayed with, and we even had divine service there on a Sunday. The master of the house sat down at my feet, listening with great attention. O! that we could spend more time among them. Things would then soon assume a more promising appearance. We preach to high and low, that Jesus Christ is our wisdom, our righteousness, our sanctification, and our redemption."—vol. ii. pp. 153—155.

The following is another remarkable instance of the union of the wisdom of the serpent with the simplicity of the dove:—

"He was waiting one morning in the ante-chamber of the palace at Tanjore, for an interview with the rajah, when he was thus accosted by a Brahmin, who was attending there for the same purpose. 'Mr. Swartz, do you not think it a very bad thing to touch a pariah?' 'O yes,' replied the venerable missionary, 'a very bad thing.' The Brahmin, however, perceiving, by his manner that more was meant than expressed, asked again, 'But, Mr. Swartz, what do you mean by a pariah?' 'I mean,' the good man answered, 'a thief, a liar, a slanderer, a drunkard, an adulterer, a proud man.' 'O then,' said the Brahmin, hastily interrupting him, 'we are all pariahs.' Thus was

he made to perceive how insignificant, in the missionary's opinion, was his boasted superiority over the pariah: while the lesson was calculated to teach him the only distinction, in the sight of God, between one man and another."—vol. ii. pp. 155, 156.

Now we would earnestly recommend these incidents to the attention of *all Europeans* in India, of whatever rank or occupation. If there be any individuals now extant in that country, who fancy that the fortress of the native prepossessions may be reduced by assault—if there be any who imagine that the superstitions of the Hindoos are to be beaten down by the slaughter of cows and bullocks—if there be any who suppose that the Mussulmans are either to be gained or bullied by our ostentatious banqueting on things which they deem abominable—let all such persons learn wisdom and charity from the example of Swartz. To some, perhaps, this caution may appear almost ludicrous. Nothing, however, can be more distant from our thoughts, than even a tendency towards ridicule or levity. We speak advisedly. We speak from information derived from intelligent, and right minded, and sound hearted, persons, long resident in India, and conversant with the very regions which formed the scenes of Swartz's apostolic ministry. And, upon such authority, we do gravely aver our belief, that, to this very hour, such admonition may not be altogether superfluous. With reference, more especially, to the prejudices of *caste*, let it always be remembered that a Brahmin regards the gross and carnivorous practices of the Pariah, with a feeling of disgust and horror which is but faintly imaged to our conceptions by a recollection of what would be our emotions on beholding a human being searching the ditches for the carcase of a dead dog to feed upon. This is no exaggeration. Let us add to all the qualms of physical loathing, the recoil of religious abhorrence, and then, we shall have some notion of what is to be endured by a man of the sacred order in India, when brought into contact with persons, who, not only transgress the vegetable diet, but often gorge themselves upon carrion. All this was well known to Swartz, and was never for a moment forgotten by him. It is evident, from the whole tenor of his life, that such matters formed one subject of his diligent and faithful study. From the above anecdotes it appears that, so far as the institution of caste was connected with feelings of selfish, uncharitable, and pharisaic arrogance, so far it was the object of his rebuke. But thus far he went, and no further. Instead of attempting to trample down the prejudices of men of high caste, by giving encouragement to customs from which their animal and moral

temperament revolted, his ambition was to correct and mitigate every thing in the practice of the inferior orders, which might perpetuate and embitter the mutual alienation of the different classes. His own personal habits, all this while, were such as to give the least possible offence, even to the most sensitive and scrupulous Brahmin. They were so nearly assimilated to the abstemiousness and simplicity of the holiest men among the natives, that the elements of repulsion between himself and them retained no perceptible influence. He, accordingly, was enabled to meet them, as it were upon common ground, to discuss the solemn proposal, *If Jehovah be God, follow him; but if Baal, then follow him.* We repeat, therefore, that it would be a blessed thing for India, if the example of Swartz were constantly in the recollection, not merely of missionaries and clergymen, but of Europeans of every class and profession in that country. We are satisfied, that a kind and considerate attention to the native peculiarities would do wonders to strengthen the attachment and confidence which our countrymen have already won by their attention to still weightier matters.

But there was one cause of obstruction and difficulty, which, in common with all other missionaries, Swartz often found, if possible, still more unmanageable than the superstitious habits of the country; namely, the pestilent moral example of the generality of the Europeans. This was as a lion constantly starting up in his way, for an adversary against him; and it must have tasked his courage and address to the very utmost. No sooner had he closed an urgent representation of the supreme excellence of the Christian doctrine, than the hearer would often turn round short upon him with the reply, that the doctrine might be very good, but that the lives of those who professed it showed it to be powerless; and that it was difficult to imagine what benefit the Hindoos would receive from embracing a religion which was, apparently, destitute of all influence over the hearts, and consciences, and actions, of its followers. One day, he met a Hindoo dancing master, with his female pupil, and told them that no unholy persons shall enter into the kingdom of heaven. "Alas, Sir!" said the poor girl, "in that case, hardly any European will ever enter it." Another time, a wealthy old merchant asked him, if all Europeans spoke as he did? Swartz replied, that all Europeans were not true Christians; but that there were many who were really so, and who sincerely prayed for the Hindoos, that they might become acquainted with Jesus Christ. "You astonish me," said he, "for, from what we daily observe and experience, we cannot but think Europeans, with few exceptions, to be self-interested, incon-

timent, proud, full of illiberal contempt and prejudice against us Hindoos, and even against *their own religion*; especially the higher classes. So, at least, I have found it, with the majority of those with whom I have had any intercourse." Again,

"In a journey to Tanjore," says Mr. Pæzold, in a letter to the Society, "in company with Mr. Swartz, I had an opportunity of being present at a conference between that excellent missionary and about twenty Brahmins, to whom he expounded the Christian doctrine, pointing out its great pre-eminence over their heathenism and idolatry. Their general reply to him was, 'Very true; your doctrine, your religion, your instruction is a pleasing thing; but it is inconsistent with flesh and blood; it is repugnant to our carnal affections; it strikes at the natural propensity to moral evil and to worldly pleasures. Moreover,' they replied, 'We do not see your Christian people live conformably to what they teach. The Christians appear to be doing quite the contrary: they curse, they swear, they get drunk; they steal, cheat, and deal fraudulently with one another; nay, they blaspheme, and rail upon matters of religion, and often make a mock of those who profess to be religious:' in short, they said, 'You Christians often demean yourselves as badly, if not worse, than we heathens. Now, pray,' they added, 'of what benefit and advantage is all your instruction and commendation of Christ's religion, if it does not reform the lives of your own people? Should you not first endeavour to convert your Christians, ere you attempt to proselyte pagans? To these objections, says Mr. Pæzold, whether applicable to the nominal European Christians, or to the native converts, and however, unhappily, well-founded, though obviously inconclusive, "Mr. Swartz replied with so much propriety, and with such wonderful intrepidity and energy, that at length the Brahmins unanimously exclaimed, 'Of a truth, you are a holy man; and if all your Christians thought, and spake, and lived as you do, we would, without delay, undergo the change, and become Christians also.'"—vol. ii. pp. 310, 311.

In this, and similar passages, all dissolute and godless Europeans may hear a most exterminating rebuke. They find themselves ranged, even by the idolaters, among the worst enemies to the Cross. By what precise line of argument the venerable missionary was accustomed to dispose of this formidable class of objections, we are not distinctly informed. He would probably say, and say very justly, that it would be most iniquitous to charge any religion, or any rule of life, with the bad consequences which result only from the *neglect* of it. But this answer would scarcely be sufficient to silence many an ignorant, bigoted, and slavish heathen. For to such a person, any system of faith or discipline, which was unable to make itself respected, and which suffered a gross neglect of all its sanctions to pass with total impunity, even in this life, would, probably, appear but a poor

and contemptible thing. From all that is known of Swartz, however, it may very safely be inferred, that, after he had been some time in India, he would be in constant preparation for such adversaries, and would be in readiness to answer the foolish people, according to their folly, in all its shapes and varieties. That he felt the difficulty is evident, from his frequent, though temperate complaints of the discord between the precepts of the Gospel, and the practice of its European professors. There is some reason to hope that the missionary labour will henceforth be less formidably embarrassed by this grievous stumbling-block; and that the carelessness, the profligacy, and the impiety of the *Franks* will no longer be *an astonishment and a curse* to the nations who fall down before wood and stone.

If this hope should not be frustrated,—if the European professors of the Gospel should, in future, walk more worthily of their sacred calling,—the prospects of Christianity in the east, we may presume, would rapidly brighten. We hear it frequently remarked, that by a very slow, but still a perceptible process, this fabric of the native Superstition is wasting away. Even so long ago as the year 1778, it was remarked by Swartz, in one of his communications to the Society, that among the Hindoos of Trichinopoly and Tanjore, there were many thousands, even of the Brahmins, who confessed that their Idolatry was vain and sinful. When hard pressed by the arguments of the honoured missionary, they would sometimes exclaim—“ True; what virtue can there be in all our images, and innumerable ceremonies? There is but one Supreme Being, the Maker and Preserver of all!”—“ Hardly a day passes,” he says, “ in which Brahmins do not visit my house at Tanjore, hear attentively what is addressed to them, frequently take up a book in which the doctrines of Christianity are explained, and praise it as a Divine Religion.” It is true, that these men would often look into the mirror of the Divine Law, and then retire ignorant or forgetful of what manner of persons they were. But Swartz would not often suffer them to depart without an endeavour to fix their attention on the features of their own *natural face*.

“ A Brahmin,”—he continues, “ being asked, what he would resolve upon, whether he intended to stifle his conviction, or to receive the divine doctrine, and to profess it,—replied, that he could not deny the impression he had received, and that he had sounded some of his acquaintance; but that they all insisted on the task as too difficult and dangerous, on account of the great numbers of the professors of Idolatry. Nothing, therefore, but fear, keeps them, at present, from embracing the Christian Religion; but it is to be hoped that this conviction will embolden them, one day or other, to shake off the inglorious

servitude of sin and Satan. For my part," he adds, "I entertain a cheerful hope of seeing better days; and, therefore rejoice in the present opportunity of preaching the Gospel of Christ, frequently calling to my mind, that there is a time of sowing preceding that of reaping."—vol. i. pp. 327, 328.

We can easily imagine the thankfulness and exultation with which he would have seen the things which we now see; the Legislature of England awakened to a sense of its responsibilities, the Church of England expanding herself to the East, the auspicious commencement of, we trust, a long line of Apostolic Prelates, and a College raised up for the nurture and training of Evangelists! And if, in addition to these glorious and animating signs, we could behold the accomplishment of that first wish of Bishop Middleton's heart—that *the Christians should be christianized*,—what might we not expect to see achieved among the superstitious millions of the East? Surely they would be provoked to jealousy and to shame by the spectacle of Christian righteousness and purity! Surely the grotesque and gigantic follies of their creed would, gradually, fall down before the Cross of Christ!

There is one other point, in which the wisdom and caution of Swartz were uniformly manifested. It has been frequently, and very mischievously asserted, that the Hindoo converts adopted Christianity much in the same spirit as the multitudes followed our Saviour—purely for the sake of the loaves and the fishes. Now Swartz, we find, was always vigilantly upon his guard against such mercenary and selfish proselytes.

"He is very careful," observes Mr. Pohlé, in a letter to the Society, "with regard to receiving both heathens and Roman Catholics into the Church. *He has nothing to do with people who want only to be fed, or that are unknown vagabonds.* But such as are known, and wish to be Christians, and, after being received, to eat the labour of their own hands, them it would be unjust to reject, though they should want a little assistance during the time of their preparation. They must live from hand to mouth: *and it would be cruel not to assist them, under the pretence of a supposed hypocrisy,* or lest it should be looked upon as buying Christians for money."—vol. i. p. 395.

Here we have the triple alliance of Christian prudence, and justice, and benevolence, in its perfection. And we trust that the example has not been lost sight of by those who have succeeded to his labours.

Of Swartz as a preacher, we are left to form our conceptions chiefly from the wonderful effects produced by his ministry. Of his written compositions for the pulpit, only four have been preserved; and these are printed by Dr. Pearson in the fourteenth chapter of this work, (vol. ii. pp. 41—76). Like every thing he



did, they are remarkable for plainness and energy. They betray an intense solicitude for the inculcation of the prime and fundamental verities of the Gospel. They are evidently conceived in the same spirit with which a man like Howard would labour for the relief of those children of adversity who were outcasts from all other sympathy. The care of the preacher is only for the necessitous and perishing souls of his hearers. He no more thought of entertaining them with minute criticism or gaudy rhetoric, than a philanthropist would think of laying sweetmeats or dainties before a starving multitude. The bread of life, and the waters of life, and the simple and sovereign medicine for diseased spirits—these were the things which his sacred office called on him to bring forth out of his store; and, beyond these, all would have been a mere mockery of the want and wretchedness around him. The following description of him, when he was approaching his seventieth year, is given by the excellent Mr. Gerické:—

“ ‘ I found him,’ says Mr. Gerické, ‘ as healthy and vigorous as he was several years ago. He devotes four hours every day to the instruction of English and Tamul children, and such native Christians as are prepared for baptism; after which he enters into the most cheerful and edifying conversation with those who visit him.

“ ‘ The purity of his mind, his disinterestedness and strict integrity, his active zeal for the prosecution of the mission, and his constant attention to the temporal as well as spiritual prosperity of the native Christians, his indefatigable exertions to procure them the means of subsistence, his pastoral wisdom and charity, his fervour in prayer, his eminent talent of engaging the attention even of mixed companies by the manner and tone of his conversation, his peculiar skill in noticing defects and reproofing faults with so friendly and cheerful an air, that even the highest and proudest are not offended—these, and many other excellent qualities but rarely found together, render him universally beloved and respected; and even the whole of his outward deportment, his silver locks, and serenely beaming eye, and all the features of his countenance, are calculated to inspire both veneration and affection.

“ ‘ I spent a whole week with this patriarch in a very delightful manner, and almost forgot in his society that I was sick.’ ”—vol. ii. pp. 271, 272.

We have already remarked that the memory of Swartz has laboured under one imputation, which, if well-founded, might partially impair the veneration which his humane and pious labours have so generally commanded. It has been imagined that the spirit of worldly and secular intrigue was allowed occasionally to mix itself up with his more exalted motives. Now as his name must ever be a precious possession to the missionary cause, it is a positive duty to rescue it from the damage inflicted by such a suspicion. For this reason, it may be advisable to pre-



sent the reader with a very succinct statement of the extent to which he was connected with temporal and political matters.

The first occasion which involved him in any secular employment was in 1779. In that year Sir Thomas Rumbold, the Governor of Madras, requested him to undertake a confidential mission to Hyder Ali, at Seringapatam, with a view to ascertain his actual disposition with respect to the English, and to assure him of the pacific intentions of the Madras government. He requested time for consideration, and the result was that he thought it his duty not to decline the proposal. His reasons were, first, that the mission was purely pacific, (for at that time he believed the governor's intentions to be upright and honourable): secondly, that it would enable him to announce the Gospel in many parts where it had never been known before: thirdly, he was anxious to show his gratitude for the repeated kindness he had experienced from the Honourable Company. At the same time he resolved to keep his hands undefiled with bribes, and actually received not one farthing, save his travelling expenses. The journey was taken. The missionary was allowed to pass in safety. He was courteously admitted to an audience with the usurper, who—to use the words of Swartz himself—gave a plain answer to all the questions which he had been ordered to put; so that the Honourable Board at Madras received the information they desired. On taking his leave, he explained the motives of his journey to Hyder as follows:—

“ ‘You may, perhaps, wonder,’ said I, ‘what could have induced me, a priest, who has nothing to do with political concerns, to come to you, and that on an errand which does not properly belong to my sacerdotal functions. But as I was plainly told that the sole object of my journey was the preservation and confirmation of peace, and having witnessed, more than once, the misery and horrors attending on war, I thought within my own mind, how happy I should deem myself if I could be of service in cementing a durable friendship between the two governments, and thus securing the blessings of peace to this devoted country and its inhabitants. This I considered as a commission in no wise inconsistent with my office as a minister of a religion of peace.’ He said, with great cordiality, ‘Very well! very well! I am of the same opinion with you; and my only wish is, that the English would live in peace with me. If they offer me the hand of peace and concord, I shall not withdraw mine, provided—.’ ‘But of these mysterious provisions, nothing,’ observes Colonel Wilks, ‘can now be ascertained.’” — Vol. i. pp. 361, 362.

On the return of Swartz to Madras, the governor communicated to his Council the result of this mission, which seems to have been undertaken without their knowledge. But it is remarkable that no official record or report of the whole transaction

is extant, either in India or in this country. But though a degree of mystery still hangs over the details of this affair, one manifest good resulted from it. On his departure from Seringapatam, a bag of 300 rupees was sent to him by Hyder. This he delivered to the Board at Madras, who, however, insisted on his keeping it. He consented, on the condition that he might appropriate it to the establishment of an Orphan School at Tanjore. The design was accordingly commenced, and was afterwards carried into extensive and beneficial execution.—(vol. i. pp. 341—368.)

In 1783 his services were again put in requisition. Commissioners had been appointed to proceed to the camp of Tippoo Saib, to enter into negotiations for a treaty of peace. In consequence of the well-known integrity and ability of Swartz, and his familiar knowledge of the native language—of which the commissioners were ignorant—he was solicited by Lord Macartney, the Governor of Madras, to join them, and to act as their interpreter with the Sultan of the Mysore. “By complying with this request,” said his lordship, “you will render an essential service to the public, and confer an obligation on the Company.” The reply of Swartz was, that “his repugnance to a political mission, though great, had yielded to his desire of rendering the Company any service in his power.” That the object of the government was defeated, so far as Swartz was concerned, will appear from the following very important extract of a letter addressed by Colonel Fullarton to the Government of Madras:—

“ ‘ On our second march we were visited by the Rev. Mr. Swartz, whom your lordship and the board requested to proceed as a faithful interpreter between Tippoo and the commissioners. *The knowledge and the integrity of this irreproachable missionary have retrieved the character of Europeans from imputations of general depravity.* A respectable escort attended him to the nearest encampment of the enemy, but he was stopped at Sattimungalum, and returned to Tanjore. I rejoice, however, that he undertook the business; for his journal, which has been before your Board, evinces that the southern army acted towards our enemies with a mildness seldom experienced by friends in moments of pacification. From him also you learned, that this conduct operated on the minds of the inhabitants, who declared that we afforded them more secure protection than the commanders of their own troops.’ ”—vol. ii. p. 16.

The next demand upon him was in 1786, when a committee was appointed by Sir Archibald Campbell, the governor of Madras, to watch over the affairs and interests of Tanjore, which the government had resolved to place under their own temporary superintendence, in consequence of intolerable oppression exercised by the Rajah Tuljajee and his ministers.

“ With this committee Sir Archibald Campbell proposed to unite Mr. Swartz; observing, ‘ There are abundant proofs on record of the zeal, ability and services of the Rev. Mr. Swartz, whose accurate local knowledge, and facility in the country languages, and, above all, whose high estimation with the rajah, from an intercourse of thirty years, must render his assistance of essential consequence on such occasions.

“ ‘ His presence, if possible, should always be requested in the committee, in which he should have an honorary seat, and he should also be desired to interpret and translate whatever may be necessary, and to subjoin his signature to all such examinations and translations.’

“ Shortly after this important appointment, Mr. Huddleston proposed to the governor that Mr. Swartz should not only have a seat but a voice in the committee; stating that he had exerted the political authority of his situation, ‘ in conjunction only with that excellent man,’ and adding, ‘ It is, and will be as long as I live, my greatest pride, and most pleasing recollection, that from the moment of my entering on this responsible station, I have consulted with Mr. Swartz on every occasion, and taken no step of the least importance without his previous concurrence and approbation; nor has there been a difference of sentiment between us in any one instance. Adverting only to the peculiar circumstances under which the committee begins its administration, and the prospect they present, you will I am persuaded, sir, readily conceive of how serious a consideration it must be to me to have both the advice and effectual support of Mr. Swartz in the adoption of that conduct which our concurrent judgment may approve. Happy, indeed,’ continued the resident, himself no mean judge of moral and political merit, ‘ happy would it be for this country, for the company, and for the rajah himself, when his eyes should be opened, if he possessed the whole authority, and were invested with power to execute all the measures that his wisdom and benevolence would suggest.’

“ In reply to this communication, the governor expressed his entire acquiescence in the resident’s suggestion, and added, ‘ such is my opinion of Mr. Swartz’s abilities and integrity, that I have recommended to the board that he should be admitted a member of the committee, without any reservation whatever; and my confidence in him is such that I think many advantages may be derived therefrom.’”—pp. 113—115.

Swartz accepted his seat in this committee, only on condition that his aid should be confined to those occasions which did *not* involve coercive or violent proceedings, “ which he considered as unbecoming the character of his mission.” All his proceedings, in conjunction with the committee, were regulated by the same moderate and pacific spirit; and the government were so deeply impressed with the value of his services, that they granted him a salary of £100 per annum as interpreter to the company at Tanjore; with a monthly allowance of twenty pagodas for a palankeen.—(vol. ii. pp. 113—120.)

In these transactions it would be difficult to discern any thing

at variance with the sacred and spiritual office which was the main business of Swartz's life; unless it can be maintained that a minister of the gospel is bound to abstain, however urgently called upon, from rendering incidental services to his fellow-creatures touching their secular interests. Such employments were never sought by the missionary. He embraced them with hesitation and reluctance; and they were brought upon him solely by the prevalent conviction that no other man united so many transcendent qualifications for the work.

The only remaining occasion which implicated him in political concerns, had its commencement in 1787. We have no space for the details of this matter. They are scattered over Dr. Pearson's second volume. The outline is briefly this:—the rajah of Tanjore, Tuljajee, being without a heir to his throne, adopted one of his relatives, a boy of ten years old, and named him Serfogee. He then sent for Swartz, and would have made him guardian to the boy. This charge Swartz declined; suggesting that the office would more fitly be entrusted to the rajah's brother, Ameer Sing. This person was accordingly appointed guardian to Serfogee, and regent of the country, till the boy should be of a proper age for the public affairs. On the death of Tuljajee the British government, after consulting the native authorities as to the validity of the adoption, set aside the adopted son, and placed Ameer Sing upon the throne. The administration of the new rajah was intolerable. His treatment of Serfogee perfidious and cruel. Swartz, who was then fixed at Tanjore, was unable to witness these enormities without deep and painful interest. He exerted himself warmly and indefatigably with the Madras government, both for the correction of public abuses, and for the deliverance of Serfogee from the custody of his jealous and unfeeling relative. In the latter object he was completely successful; and Serfogee was at last removed to Madras, with a suitable establishment. In 1796 the proceedings by which Serfogee had been set aside underwent a final revision, which terminated in the establishment of his claims to the throne. These claims were eventually recognized and confirmed by the court of directors; but their decision did not reach India till Swartz was removed from the scene of all transitory interests.

The transactions, of which the above is a mere sketch, were spread over the last ten years of Swartz's life. That they occupied, from time to time, much of his thoughts, is unquestionable; but they were attended with no sacrifice of his missionary duties. It is further irresistibly evident, from the whole history, that he was involved in these affairs, not by any propensity of his own to-

wards political intrigue; but solely by his exalted reputation for probity and intelligence. Here was a man who had been in the country nearly forty years,—whose knowledge of the languages was consummate,—who had won the confidence and veneration of all ranks, and nearly the idolatry of the lower classes, by the pure force of character—and who, in spite of himself, was become a sort of oracle among the people. It was next to impossible that such a man should escape from some entanglement in critical matters, which demanded a profound acquaintance with local interests, a perfect familiarity with the habits of the natives, and a name for moral worth and unsullied integrity. That he was not ambitious of political influence and distinction, is obvious from the fact, that he declined the guardianship of the adopted boy, and recommended for that office a man who, *as it afterwards turned out*, was utterly unworthy of confidence. They, however, who would fully and distinctly understand the conduct of Swartz at this period of his life, must consult the narrative of Dr. Pearson. For those who have not opportunity or inclination to do so, it may be sufficient to peruse the following testimony of Sir John Shore, (afterwards Lord Teignmouth,) in a minute addressed by him to the court of directors:—

“ ‘ With regard to Mr. Swartz, whose name the president has never heard mentioned without respect, and who is as distinguished for the sanctity of his manners, as for his ardent zeal in the promulgation of his religion; whose years, without impairing his understanding, have added weight to his character; and whose situation has enabled him to be the protector of the oppressed, and the comforter of the afflicted; who, a preacher of the Christian faith, and a man without influence, except from character, was held in such estimation by the late rajah, a Hindoo prince, approaching to his dissolution, that he thought him the fittest person he could consult concerning the management of his country during the minority of his adopted son Serfogee; and who, displaying more integrity than foresight, in the advice he gave, did certainly not prove himself the enemy of Ameer Sing, since, at his suggestion, he was named regent—to the solemn assurance of such a man, the president is compelled to declare his unqualified assent; and upon his information he can easily reconcile the difference between the personal declarations and the letters of the rajah.’ ”—pp. 320, 321.

The days of this incomparable Christian were now drawing to a close. He was full of years, full of labour, and full of honors; of such honors, as will often crowd about the name of a faithful servant of God, even in this world, with all its corruption, and with all its ingratitude. There are few things more animating or more consolatory than to contemplate such triumphs of “the irresistible might” of Christian meekness, and righteousness, and love. From the “high places” of power and authority, down to the hut of the oppressed and helpless drudges on the soil, there

was but one voice respecting Swartz. Christians and Idolaters, Brahmins and Pariahs, the honest and the worthless, all were compelled to feel and to acknowledge the excellence and the majesty of genuine godliness. To use the language of Colonel Blackburn, the subsequent distinguished resident at Tanjore,—“the good naturally desired his advice and assistance; the bad were anxious to obtain the sanction of his respectable name.” And then, as his biographer very justly remarks, “it must have been impossible to converse with him without being convinced of the identity of true piety and real happiness. Though, like the aged patriarch, at the close of life, amidst the pressure of disease and pain, and in the anticipation of eternity, he might be allowed to call the present a sorrowful world, few, perhaps, ever passed through the world with nobler and purer enjoyment. He was equally welcome, and equally happy, at the palace and the cottage, amidst the Councils of princes, and the instructions and conversation of the poor.” It was a favorite saying of his own, that a well directed will is a heaven upon earth. And, according to this maxim, he must have carried about with him a paradise in his own bosom: for his will seems to have been as nearly identified, as the will of any fallen man’s can be, with that of our heavenly father. Many affecting particulars are collected by Dr. Pearson, relative to the closing scene of his life. Of these there is one which we cannot forbear to repeat. Gerické was watching by his death bed. He lay with his eyes closed, motionless, and, to all appearance, lifeless; his companion thought that the spirit had taken wing, and began to sing one of his favorite hymns. He had sung the first verse, and was beginning the second; when, to his amazement, and delight, the dying saint joined him, with a firm and clear voice, and accompanied him to the end. Shortly afterwards, he was raised on his cot, bowed his head, closed his eyes, and without groan or struggle, placidly rendered up his spirit to his Redeemer.

The honors paid to his memory are well known. A monument to him was erected at Madras by the Court of Directors; and another by the Rajah Serfogee in the Mission Church at Tanjore, which he ordered to be fixed to the pillar next to the pulpit from which he preached. We have conversed with a gentleman who was present when this monument was raised. The rajah, his ministers, his courtiers, were all in the church, and listened with profound and reverent attention to the funeral sermon delivered by John Kohlhoff, the pious and exemplary successor of Swartz. It is pleasing to know that the prince never ceased to remember the venerable missionary as his friend, his protector, the guardian of his youth, his more than father. When he took a last view of the lifeless remains, he shed a flood of tears over them, and



covered them with a gold cloth. Of the rajah's faithfulness to the memory of his friend, one noble instance is recorded here. After Swartz's death, a report prevailed that it was his highness's intention to take down the church erected by Swartz within the fort, and to rebuild it on the esplanade. When the Resident, with all possible delicacy and respect, mentioned this subject to Serfojee, with a view to ascertain his intentions, nothing could be more striking than the effect of the application. "He became agitated;"—says Col. Blackburn, who was present,—"*his colour brightened; he half rose from his seat; and his first words, in answer to the resident, were an indignant reproach to that gentleman, for paying any attention to the calumny. And, he added, in a somewhat loud and passionate tone, so far from pulling down any church built by Mr. Swartz, I would, if his successors wanted a church in the fort, and could not find a convenient spot to build it on, give them a place in my own palace for the purpose.* I retain, continues Colonel Blackburn, a very lively remembrance of the force of the rajah's expressions, and of the energy of his look and manner, when he spurned at a calumny, injurious to his honor as a prince, and to his undecaying feelings of grateful attachment to his preceptor, benefactor, and friend."

The property which Swartz left behind him amounted to between eight and ten thousand pounds sterling. But then, be it always remembered that he had made this accumulation, not for himself, or for his relatives, *but solely and entirely for the benefit of the mission*. He had, in fact, many years before his death, made over to trustees, for this holy purpose, whatever he might die possessed of. It may seem surprising that he should have been able to gather such a sum. But this will appear the less strange, when we recollect the extreme frugality of his personal habits, and that for a considerable time he received a salary from the Madras government. The interest of this salary, and often a great part of the salary itself, he allowed to fall into the mission capital. The fund thus generously provided, combined with the allowances of the British government, from the Rajah of Tanjore, and from other sources, was sufficient, during many years, to support the charities, and to defray the ordinary expenditure, of the mission of Tanjore, and its branch in Tinnevely.

Our limits warn us that we must here break off; which, however, we cannot do without offering our grateful acknowledgments to Dr. Pearson for his valuable labours. To his volumes we earnestly invite the attention of all who are desirous of contemplating the character of a consummate missionary. We earnestly hope that his work will be widely circulated. To all who shall devote themselves to the office of proclaiming the tidings of salvation in heathen lands, we consider it as absolutely indispensable.



Art. VII.—*Diary of Ralph Thoresby, F.R.S., Author of the Topography of Leeds, (1677—1724.)* Now first published from the original MS. By the Rev. Joseph Hunter, F.S.A. 2 Vols. 8vo. London: Colburn and Bentley, New Burlington Street, 1830.

2. *Letters of Eminent Men addressed to Ralph Thoresby, F.R.S.* Now first published from the original MS. 2 Vols. 8vo. London: Colburn and Bentley, New Burlington Street, 1832.

THE *Ducatus Leodiensis* of Ralph Thoresby is probably the most complete specimen in existence of a branch of writing proverbially unimportant and uninteresting to the general Reader; but, on the other hand, peculiarly attractive to those whom it more immediately concerns. No man, perhaps, ever laboured so long, so fully, or to so good purpose on local topography as the Historian of Leeds; and well and richly did he merit the splendid reprint, the luxury of ample margin, of acute type, and of membranaceous paper, in which his memory was revived not long since by the ardour of a kindred Antiquarian Spirit. It may be doubted whether the publications now before us are so much calculated to keep alive Thoresby's literary fame, as is that labour of love for which we are indebted to Dr. Whitaker: but although neither the entries in his Diary, nor the Letters of his Friends, exhibit Thoresby in the highest class of Intellects, although, doubtless, there are many littlenesses and weaknesses in both which may provoke a smile, nevertheless, we rise from the perusal of the volumes in which they are contained with undiminished admiration of his piety, his benevolence, and his integrity; and with a conviction that there are not many characters which, with equal advantage on points so important as those which we have specified, would bear a similar complete revelation and development.

Ralph Thoresby was the son of a Merchant at Leeds, who during the Great Rebellion had espoused the opinions of Fairfax; and who lived long enough to perceive, and as it would seem had candour enough to acknowledge, the incalculable mischief which that very well-meaning, but not very long-sighted, tool of others men's ambition, had been duped into advancing. Fairfax, although not a man of learning, was tinctured with some knowledge of History and Antiquities; studies in which John Thoresby was a proficient; and this congeniality of pursuit contributed no doubt to cement their attachment. The coins and medals which Fairfax had collected, and which were purchased from his Family by John Thoresby, laid the foundation of a Museum which, at a time when similar depositories were rare, attracted considerable public attention; and the exhibition of which to

curious visitors occasioned inroads upon his time, which Ralph often most pathetically laments.

The town of Leeds witnessed the birth of its future Historian on the 16th of August, 1658. His life presents no marked incidents, and was spent in repose. Somewhat prematurely, indeed, he succeeded to his Father's mercantile station; but for the rest, it was more seasonably that he married, provided heirs, and died. His abandonment of the Dissenters, in whose principles he had been rigidly educated, is the most prominent event of his otherwise very equable career. In commercial pursuits he was not fortunate; but he was esteemed and lived in familiar intercourse with many of the leading men of his day. He died on the 16th October, 1725: having contributed much incidental assistance to several of his literary friends, and having published separately on his own account three Works of no small repute in their time: 1st, *The Ducatus Leodiensis*, which we have already mentioned, and to which is appended, 2d, *The Museum Thoresbyanum*, a Catalogue of his Rarities; and 3d, *The Vicaria Leodiensis*, a Biographical Notice of all the Vicars of the Parish of Leeds.

On the final dispersion of the *Museum Thoresbyanum*, which took place by auction in 1764, the MS. Collection of Letters from celebrated persons, now published, was purchased for the British Museum. Some portions of the Diary were discovered a few years back in a garret in the City, and were thence transferred to the Library of the London Institution; another volume is in the possession of Christ's Hospital; and we are by no means sorry to add that the rest are supposed to be "irrecoverably lost." So far as the Public is concerned they are not among *deperdita* which need be lamented in an additional Chapter to a new Edition of *Pancirollus*.

The Diary commences in 1677, when Thoresby, at that time eighteen years of age, was sent by his Father to a relation in London, in order that he might qualify himself for Counting House duties. The first Letter preserved is dated two years afterwards. It is but just to premise that the writer very little contemplated the posthumous exhibition to which he has been thus destined, more than a Century after his entombment; and that the petty memoranda recorded were probably never intended to meet any eye except his own. Similar Diaries were much in vogue among the Sect to which he belonged in youth; and they were in truth considered in some degree as forming part of the grand duty of self-discipline and examination. "I would have you," says John Thoresby, writing to his son immediately after his settlement in London, "in a little book, which you may either buy or make of two or three sheets of paper, take a little journal of

any thing remarkable every day, principally as to yourself, as suppose, Aug. 2, I was at such a place; or I omitted such a duty; or such a one preached from such a text, and my heart was touched; or I was a negligent hearer; or otherwise, &c. I have thought this a good method for one to keep a good tolerable decorum in actions, &c. because he is to be accountable to himself as well as to God, which we are too apt to forget." If a man could be sure of remembering, and also of having opportunity to burn these ledgers on the day before his decease, then might each of us keep them with impunity; but who could close his eyes in peace if the misgiving once crossed him, that this familiar blazon was likely to rise up against him in print, long after the arrival of the time at which, even if it be his unhappy lot to remain unburied, his Ghost shall have finished its shivering probation on the banks of Styx.

But an Editor in possession of an autobiography is not less callous than a Surgeon who has the good fortune to be selected for the demonstration of a Mummy; and Mr. Hunter, accordingly, *unrolls* Ralph, the son of John, with as little compunction as Mr. Pettigrew evinced, when performing the like kind office, not long since, for Horsiasi, son of Naspihiniegori. Much are we solaced by learning from the Preface that the last supposed descendant "of this learned, judicious, and religious Antiquary," died so far back as 1781; and that there is not any known male representative who can wince at this rude handling of his great-grand-sire's bones.

In the outset, Thoresby appears to have been but a Babe in Antiquarian Etymologies. Thus on visiting the Peak in Derbyshire he tells us, that from the height above the Cavern he "had a full prospect of Mam Torr. Torr signifies in the Derbyshire dialect a stony, craggy hill: and Mam either because it is *maimed* and broken at the top thereof; or to follow the vulgar pronunciation, it is *Mam* Torr or the *Mother* hill, because, as the ingenious Dr. Fuller expresses it, it is always delivered and presently with child again; for incredible heaps of sandy earth constantly fall down from it, yet it is in no way diminished, having, it should seem, as a constant stream, a secret spring whence it is recruited." In a similar strain we are told that Edinburgh Castle is called the *Maiden* Castle, because "the Kings of the Picts used to keep their daughters in it at needle-work till marriage." The precise Celtic usage of *Mam* (a word found largely in all our rocky districts, in Devonshire not less than in Derbyshire) may, perhaps, admit of discussion, although not very much in the spirit with which Thoresby would have undertaken it. But it may be safely affirmed, without detracting from the reputation of either

the Fortress or its fair inhabitants, that the title *maiden* has nothing whatever to do with their *pucelage*. It is plainly a corruption of the French *magne* or *mane*, and has no other import than the principal or *main* defence.

Few improvements are more marked than the superiority which the present Generation holds over its predecessors in every thing appertaining to travelling; and to this conclusive testimony of increased civilization we may often advert in the accounts given by Thoresby of his cumbrous progresses from Leeds to London and back again. We doubt, however, whether even Scotland now-a-days could furnish, on any of its most rugged mountains over which a *Guide* would undertake to conduct travellers, a road (that which is *impassable* is not to be called a *pass*) so terrific as that which is described below.

"Up by twelve o'clock, in order to a journey, and, with a guide, were got over most prodigious high hills and very many of them by day-break; thence, by Teviotdale, upon the brink of a steep hill for some miles, to Usedale, where, upon the sudden, the precipice grew to that height and steepness, and withal so exceedingly narrow, that we had not one inch of ground to set a foot upon to alight from the horse. Our danger here was most dreadful, and, I think, inconceivable to any that were not present; we were upon the side of a most terrible high hill, in the middle whereof was a track for the horse to go in, which we hoped to find broader, that we might have liberty to turn the horse; but, instead of that, it became so narrow, that there was an impossibility to get further; for now it begun likewise to be a sudden declension, and the narrow way so cumbered with shrubs, that we might be forced to lie down upon the horses' necks, and have our eyes upon a dreadful precipice, such as mine eyes never till then beheld, nor could I have conceived the horror of it by any one's relation. We had above us a hill, so desperately steep, that our aching hearts durst not attempt the scaling of it, it being much steeper than the roofs of many houses; but the hill below was still more ghastly, as steep for a long way as the walls of a house; and the track we had to ride in was now become so narrow, that my horse's hinder foot slipped off, which Mr. Hickson, following after, saw, but wisely concealed, else the fright might possibly have sunk me. To add to our torments, there was a river run all along (which added to the dizziness of our heads) close to the foot of the precipice, which we expected every moment to be plunged into, and into eternity. In this extremity (which now, many years after, in transcribing this imperfect account from the loose papers, makes my very hairs stand on end upon my head,) there was no way but by catching hold of the boughs of a tree, to throw myself off on the wrong side the horse, (which I expected to have been dashed in pieces,) and to climb up the hill, which became in a short space, less steep, that the horses also escaped. In the like danger were my fellow-travellers, and by the like watchful providence preserved."—*Diary*, vol. i. p. 105, 106.

Thoresby nicely husbanded his time; at all seasons rising long before cockcrow, (we find one entry on November 6, 1682, "morning, up *rather too early* about two,") and grudging the loss of every moment which he was obliged to waste on unprofitable secularity. An evening spent with an assembly, at a concert, or in the theatre, would have been stigmatized by him with bitter reproach, for the very names were abomination to the ears of the Nonconformists, and stank of brimstone in their nostrils. Nevertheless it would not be easy to decide whether the occupation which he has recorded below as filling two whole consecutive days was in any degree less frivolous, than walking the sinful maze of a minuet, or listening to the profane voices of songsters and play-actors.

' "13. Forenoon employed chiefly in cementing the pieces of a large ancient figure of Seneca's head, that worthy philosopher: after writing of some pedigrees.

"23. Up about four, transcribing the Earl of Northumberland's funeral sermon till day, most of which was spent in drawing the pictures of Cardinal Wolsey and Queen Catharine Dowager, from Burnet's History."—*Diary*, vol. i. p. 113.

While on a visit to Harrowgate in 1682, he had the benefit of Mr. Sharpe's ministry, who on one occasion "made a most incomparable discourse, both learned and long (*not tedious*), for he preached two hours and a half by Mr. W.'s and Church clock." On the following Sunday "good Mr. Gunter," who does not appear to have extended his tether so far, was much less fortunate in the temper of his hearer. Thoresby attended him "after water-time in the morning," but he was "indisposed with the waters, which made him excessively drowsy."

A journey to London in the Spring of the following year affords some amusing specimens of the sedateness which on all occasions regulated this excellent man's conduct. On his arrival at York, he spent the evening in visits and trivial business, but he rose betimes on the following morning, in order to make his preparations, "being somewhat concerned about company, fearful of being confined to a coach for so many days with unsuitable persons and not one I know of." The first passenger he picked up increased the alarm, for he was Richard Sterne, Esq. a son of the Archbishop of York; but he proved "very good company and not so hot as I feared." The coach advanced leisurely, and by the slowness of its movements gave our Antiquary full opportunity to transcribe monumental inscriptions at Newark and at Stamford, and to record Grantham as noted for its steeple, for Bishop Fox's Benefactions, and "for a peculiar sort of thin cake called Grantham Whetstones." It is not until five

days after his arrival in London that we obtain, by the following entry, any insight into that which doubtless was the chief object of the expedition.

"March 1. Morning writing, and then at Blackwell Hall, and with cousin R. Idle; after dinner at Mr. Wright's; employed in his shop amongst books till about four, when called upon by cousin Milner; spent most of the evening with him, at Mr. Hill's; by-the-bye, observing his comely and virtuous daughters, concerning whom I have had some letters from the north. Then at Mr. Stretton's."—*Diary*, vol. i. p. 156.

On the 6th of the same month we find him "much concerned in mind with what Mr. Stretton (the Rev. Richard Stretton, a Nonconformist minister, who exercised great influence over him), was discoursing of, a matter of great moment as to me."—On the 12th he

"spent most of the day in visits, particularly at Mr. Hill's, till pretty late in the evening, endeavouring to observe, &c.; after, discoursing cousin D. very seriously, about what I am solicited to by some that wish me well. Lord! direct me therein.

"13. Most of the forenoon advising with Mr. Str. and D. about ditto matter, of consequence as to my particular."—*Diary*, vol. i. pp. 158, 159. But, alas! for the failure of the comely Miss Hill, by the arrival of the 17th "ditto," the fickle swain has completely changed his tack.

"Dined at Mr. H.'s, with Mr. E. H.; with them till near four; then discoursing with Mr. Denham on a matter of moment as to me. . . . went home with him to visit his lovely daughter, &c."—*Diary*, vol. i. p. 160.

On the 26th he "spent afternoon at Mr. D.'s discoursing his lovely daughter," but having perceived "several invincible objections from some foolish relations," he abandoned this pursuit as rapidly as the former; booked himself again in the Leeds *Heavy*, and returned home *re infectâ* in solitary bachelorship.

In the Autumn of 1683, Thoresby was indicted under that most intolerant statute, which exposed any one who had been present at a "factious and seditious conventicle:" to a grievous legal penalty. The magistrates, with one exception, that of his prosecutor, treated him with great civility, and through the skill of his Counsel he was acquitted. The minister, Mr. Sharpe, escaped by a remarkable accident, which we cannot be surprised that a zealous partizan should attribute to a special intervention of Providence.

"He was in a neighbour's house, whither the informers pursued him, and searched two rooms; the key of the third (where he sat alone) being in the door, one of them providentially locked it by turning the key the contrary way, and then lifting up the sneck, said, he could not



be there, for the door was locked, and the key on the outside."—*Diary*, vol. i. p. 171.

All recollections of Miss Hill and of Miss Denham were effaced in 1684, when Thoresby, being six and twenty years of age, and solicited to change his condition, was "peculiarly recommended" to Miss Mary Cholmley. Matters were so far settled in this instance, that the wedding day was absolutely appointed. But the heavier purse of a Member of Parliament prevailed upon the parents to break the match, "wherein they acted not agreeably to the great profession of Religion the family had been noted for." Another sister, "a beautiful and pious young gentlewoman," was offered in lieu of the *fiancée*; but Thoresby declined the commutation, and to the mutual sorrow of himself and of the lady of his affections, who sacrificed him in pure obedience to her parents, they parted not without many tears on both sides. The bride had "no great comfort" in her establishment and "survived not long." Thoresby's heart was made of sterner stuff, and moreover under his disappointment, he was "supported in the perusal of Charnock of Divine Providence, which I found most suitable in my present condition." Might it not be an advantageous bookselling speculation to reprint an edition of that most invaluable Narcotic, especially in *usum amantium spe ludificatorum*?

In the following year, however, Thoresby found yet surer consolation in an absolute marriage with Anna, "the comely and virtuous daughter of Mr. Richard Sykes, senior lord of the manor of Leeds." With that lady, who was "recommended" to him by her brother in law, he appears to have lived in great happiness and affection for five and thirty years, during which period she bore issue six sons and four daughters. The wedding was designedly conducted with an avoidance of any ostentation of publicity; nevertheless, according to the very uncomfortable fashion of the times, the bride and bridegroom were met and escorted into Leeds by about 300 horsemen.

The object of the Diary being chiefly to record private memoranda, little notice is taken in it of the stirring public events which marked Thoresby's earlier married years. But he has described with very picturesque simplicity the miserable state of terror which must have existed in the Northern Counties during the retreat of the Irish in the winter of 1688.

"Only I cannot omit the dreadful alarm of the flying army of Irish, and massacring Papists, who with unheard-of cruelty burnt and killed all before them. Nottingham was by express said to be so treated, insomuch that all artificers, even the most precise, spent the next, though the Lord's day (16th December) in mending the fire-arms of such as



had any, and fixing scythes, &c. in shafts (desperate weapons) for such as had none. The Mayor's account of them, with original letters, sent express to this town from divers places, are in my Collection of Autographs. Watch and ward were kept every night by the principal inhabitants in their own persons, and dispatches sent to bring intelligence, so that on Monday there were assembled at Leeds, about seven thousand horse and foot, in defence of their lives and liberties, religion and property, against those barbarous and inhuman wretches.

"These were digested into several troops and companies, under Sir John Kay, colonel; Sir William Wentworth, lieutenant-colonel; Mr. Nevile of Chevet, major: it would be endless to enter into a detail of the captains and subalterns. Our fears were now somewhat abated, when all upon a sudden at night they were raised to the height upon a most dreadful alarm, 'Horse and arms, horse and arms! the enemy are upon us—Beeston is actually burnt, and only some escaped to bring the doleful tidings!' The drums beat, the bells rang backward, the women shrieked, and such dreadful consternation seized upon all persons; some men with their wives and children left all behind them (even monies and plate upon the tables) and ran for shelter to the barns and haystacks in the fields.

"Their horror was so great and universal, that the aged people who remembered the Civil Wars, said they never knew any thing like it. Thousands of lighted candles were placed in the windows, and persons of any courage and consideration (if such a thing was to be found) ran with their arms to the bridge, and so marched towards Beeston; so that in a very small time some thousands appeared, and I among the rest, with horse and arms; and, blessed be God! the terror disappeared, it being a false alarm, taken from some drunken people, who cried out horribly, murder! murder!

"I had left a cabinet with some of the most valuable moveables for my dear to cast into the well; but she had that presence of mind, after I was mounted and gone, to go up to the turret, and told the females Beeston was safe: for if but one house was on fire it might be discovered there.

"The town being pretty well satisfied, were generally gone to bed; but about midnight was a more dreadful alarm than the former—a knocking at every door, 'Fire! Fire!' 'Horse and arms! for God's sake!' It was a piteous sight to observe the terror and confusion that all sorts of persons were now in. I was most concerned for my dear wife, who was in the family way; and when I was mounted again, I could see nothing but paleness and horror in the countenances of all men. Our scouts had brought word that Halifax beacon was burning as a general warning to the country, and that Halifax and Huddersfield were burnt. The first part was really true, though from a mistaken panic and fear, that had seized them as well as us.

"But no enemy appearing near, and watch being set at several passes, I lay me down again, but with my clothes on; and when I awoke, rejoiced to see the light of another day, when my Lord Fairfax came to town with three or four troops of horse, completely armed, and we

slept more securely, the expresses bringing pretended advice that the Irish were broke into parties and dispersed.

“Upon the whole, this matter of the alarm, which was general, and spread over most parts of England, was managed so artfully, that even when all was over, I could never learn who was concerned, even in this neighbourhood.”—*Diary*, vol. i. pp. 188—191.

The Letters of Mr. Stretton, whom we have already mentioned as one of Thoresby's most confidential advisers, are often very creditable to the writer, and putting aside certain strong sectarian prejudices, afford frequent pleasing traits of sound judgment and well-directed feeling. “I am not,” he says on one occasion, “for a morose, reserved state of life, as though Religion made men unsociable or unfit for human conversation, nor against the temperate use of wit and drollery in due season: but I would have persons to beware of habituating themselves to it, as to give others occasion to censure them that they are never serious.” But the following Letter, written under pressure of the heaviest calamity which can befall man, appears to us very rarely, if ever, to have been surpassed in genuine pathos.

“DEAR SIR,

London, May 4, 1605.

“This brings you the most sad disconsolate tidings that ever I had occasion to send you. It hath pleased the only wise God, with one stroke of his hand, to remove the desire of mine eyes, and the delight of my heart, my tender, loving, and dearly beloved wife, from me yesterday between seven and eight at night, (after four or five days of pain and sickness); with a cheerful, sweet, composed countenance, without so much as one sigh or groan, she resigned up her soul into the hands of a tender Redeemer, who loved her, and washed her from her sins in his own blood. She had no pangs in her death: she is got to rest, and I have not the least hesitation, or doubt in my own heart, but that she is as well as heart can wish; but we are left in a sad desolate and disconsolate estate. But God hath spoken, and he also hath done it, and what shall I say? I will be dumb and not open my mouth, because he hath done it; it is fit to be silent before God, when God puts us to silence. He had a greater right in her than I had; his did precede and excel mine, and he hath better provided for her than ever I could have done. My lease of her was expired and forfeited long before; and as a Sovereign he may dispose of his own as he pleaseth. She lived desired, and died as much lamented as most women of her rank ever were. She will be missed by more than near relations. I have lost as loving, tender, prudent a wife, and my son as tender careful a mother, as ever any could enjoy. Oh! what arrears of thankfulness are due, that we enjoyed her so long, and so much sweetness and comfort in her; help us with your prayers (and engage all our friends to beg) for support under, and a sanctified use and improvement of this severe providence. I have known what it is to part with sweet hopeful children, and it is hard enough to bear it; but to part with a wife, and such a wife, cuts deep and reacheth the very

soul. Mine, and my son's hearty love and service to you and your's, and to all friends. I commit you to God, and rest

"Your sorrowful, afflicted friend and servant,  
"RICHARD STRETTON."

*Letters*, vol. i. p. 202, 203.

In his journeys to London Thoresby now preferred riding on horseback to proceeding by coach; but it may be doubtful whether his convenience was always increased by the change. It was late in May, 1695, that he was detained many hours at Ware by "some showers," which so far raised the washes as to make the passengers swim, and to drown an unfortunate higgler. At Cheshunt, in order to escape the deepest wash, he crossed the meadows, yet he "rode to the saddle skirts for a considerable way." But his perils were not even then terminated, as we learn from the next day's entry.

"18. Morning, rode by Edmuntton (where we had our horses led about a mile over the deepest of the Wash) to Highbgate, and thence to London. I have the greatest cause of thankfulness, for the goodness of my heavenly protector, that being exposed to greater dangers by my horse's bogging at every coach and waggon we met, I received no damage, though the ways were very bad, the ruts deep, and the roads extremely full of water, which rendered my circumstances (often meeting the loaded waggons in very inconvenient places) not only melancholy, but really very dangerous."—*Diary*, vol. i. p. 295.

During his stay in town, one of his visits was paid to a writer, whom we sufficiently recognise as an "industrious antiquary," but whom posterity has certainly forgotten to appreciate as "an ingenious poet;" Rymer, the unwearied compiler of the invaluable *Fœdera*, whom he found, according to his vocation, "amongst the musty records supervising, his amanuensis transcribing."

Thoresby's mind had long been occupied in considering the lawfulness of conformity to the Established Church; and the scruples which education and connexion threw in his way, and which yielded tardily to reasoning and conviction, appear to have been finally removed by correspondence with a Prelate, than whom none, of the many who have ornamented our Church, was more fitted to treat a doubting conscience. The learning, gentleness, piety, and integrity of Sharp, Archbishop of York, are to be traced in every public act of his well-known career; and the reputation which he so deservedly enjoyed, cannot but be increased by the production of the following golden Letter, which, notwithstanding its length, we should feel ourselves culpable if we omitted to print entire:—

“ Good Mr. Thoresby,

Bishopsthorp, June 6, 1699.

“ I took care not only to send your letter to the Bishop of Sarum, but also to introduce and recommend you to him by a letter of mine.

“ Having this conveniency, I gladly embrace it for the sending to you a Common Prayer-Book, according to your desire. And if it will recommend it to you, that it is one that I am wont to make use of, you may take my word that it is the book I bought when I first came down from London hither, to be used by me daily in my chapel: and accordingly a great while it lay in my seat there, till afterwards I removed it to the communion-table; from whence I have now taken it, and where I usually once a month officiate, in celebrating the communion with my family.

“ I do not know any reason in the world why any body should suggest to you that the use of the Common Prayer is dangerous to the life and spirit of devotion, and that joining in our worship is the ready way to make the fervour of our minds towards God to degenerate into dull formality. I profess to you, as to my own experience, I could never find any tendency of it towards these effects. I can truly say, (and I hope upon this occasion it will be no vanity in me to say it), that I look upon my daily joining in the public service, and in the communion, whenever I have opportunity, (which here in the country is every Lord's Day,) to be the great means, with the Divine grace, that preserves a sense of God and goodness in my heart; and I would not, for the world, be deprived of this blessing. And I never found in my life, but that if I was in a fit frame and disposition of mind for holy exercises, I could be as devout, and pour out my soul to God as affectionately and fervently in the public prayers, as ever I was capable of doing in private; but a great deal more than in the public conceived prayers of others: so much virtue is there in knowing beforehand what we are to join in and say Amen to. And truly, I have found more comfort and satisfaction (I thank God for it) to my own mind, and I hope likewise more of God's blessing, from joining as well as I can in this dull way of devotion, as your people are apt to call it, than in any other religious exercise whatsoever. What I now tell you of my own experience, (and I beg your pardon for it, though, indeed, I would not have said this to any one but you, nor to you but on the present occasion,) will, I dare say, be confirmed to you by the experience of as many of our communion as you shall inquire of, that are serious and devout Christians. So that, as the writer of Dr. Hammond's Life observes truly, ‘It is the coldness of the votary, and not the prayer that is in fault, whenever fervour is deficient at the public office of the Church.’ He makes this reflection upon occasion of Dr. Hammond's fervour in his devotions even in the common service of the Church, which he there gives an account of, and which, he says, was so transporting, that tears would sometimes interrupt the Doctor's words in repeating the Confession, though he did what he could to hinder it.

“ But still you are in fear of declension, being frequently attacked

with the penitent confessions said to be made by such as have sadly experienced a decay of the life and power of religion, upon their deserting the purer institutions, &c. It is a sign they want arguments, when instead of reasoning, they apply to your fears. When they have nothing to offer that can convince your judgment, they would fright you with stories, as we do children with Raw-head and Bloody-bones. Forgive the expression; though, in truth, I think there is as much ground for the one as the other. Are not these the very artifices that both Papists and Quakers make use of for the keeping timorous people in their communion? If the stories they tell you be true, you can form no argument from them, but only that some people have come from their communion to ours, that have proved formalists and hypocrites. But what is this to the merits of the cause? unless it can be shown that this decay of the life and power of religion was a necessary effect of their deserting that party, and coming over to the Established Church, which I am certain will never be. I pray, when they talk to you upon this head, desire them to tell you what is wanting in our church that is necessary by Christ's institution, for the making any one sincerely pious, that may be had in their's. Is not the doctrine of Christ as purely taught among us as among them? Have they any arguments, or motives, or encouragements for the helping on people in the way of godliness that we have not? And why may not we then, in our way, as much expect the blessing of God and the assistance of the Holy Spirit in our endeavours against sin, and after holiness, as they can in their way? Nay, I should think a great deal more: since we keep the unity of the church according to Christ's commandment, and they, as we believe, do causelessly break it.

"But, after all, I give no more credit to these stories than I do to those I meet with in the popish books of the same nature.

"Sir, give me leave to speak my mind freely to you. I have always thought you a man of sense, as well as a sincerely good man, and I could never be without hopes that you would overcome all the prejudices of your education in this business of conformity, if you once took the matter into your serious and impartial consideration. And I am now extremely glad to find that you have so far considered these matters, and received so much satisfaction as to the points in difference upon that consideration, as that your reason is in a good measure satisfied, though you cannot conquer your fears. Why now, Sir, if this be all the bar that hinders your thorough embracing our communion; if you would take my advice, you should either cut this bar asunder or leap over it: my meaning is, you should follow your reason, and despise or break through your fears. It cannot be imagined but one that has been educated in your way, and whose notions and principles have been so long moulded towards that way, must needs find a great many scruples and fears in himself to engage in another way, though he is convinced in his judgment that, all things considered, it is a better way. But, trust me, upon such a man's trial of that better way, he will in a little time find all his fears and scruples to vanish and be satisfied

that they were but merely panic terrors. As for your worldly concerns, which you may fancy may suffer by this change of your's, I think as you do, that is not a point that ought to bear any weight with a conscientious man. But give me leave to say, I hope that is a panic terror also. God will not have the less, but the more care over you, for doing your duty; and I doubt not but you will meet with as many sincere friends to you and your's in the communion that you choose, as you lose in that which you leave.

"I have now, though with great haste, filled my sheet: I beg of you to pardon the defects and uncorrectness of what you here read. I do most heartily pray God to bless and guide you, and am sincerely

"Your affectionate friend,

*Letters*, vol. i. p. 370.

"JO. EBOR."

As life advanced, the four-and-twenty miles which separate Leeds from York, appear to have presented a gulph which Thoresby never attempted to cross without profound alarm. If he had contemplated the ascent of the Himalaya range, or had intended even to *shoot* Niagara, he could scarcely have commenced his undertaking with more solemn aspirations than those provoked on one occasion by these two dozen miles, in the heart of England, to be performed under the bright sun of May.

"Preparing for a journey to York. Lord, grant thy favourable presence and protection from sin and all dangers! We found the way very deep, and in some places dangerous for the coach, (that we walked on foot,) but the Lord preserved us from all evil accidents, that we got to our journey's end in safety, blessed be God!"—*Diary*, vol. ii. p. 5.

One ancient travelling custom, which we do not remember to have seen noticed elsewhere, is recorded in a subsequent journey.

"4. Morning, we dined at Grantham; had the annual solemnity, (this being the first time the coach passed the road in May) of the coachman and horses being decked with ribbons and flowers, the town music and young people in couples before us; we lodged at Stamford, a scurvy, dear town."—*Diary*, vol. ii. p. 207.

We have looked through the *Diary* with care, and certainly with some amusement during its perusal, but it is very difficult to make selections from the huge mass of nothings which it records. Few readers will have much interest in learning that Sir Godfrey Copley possessed in his Museum many "choice curiosities, amongst which were a Pope's Bull, a large snake, a delicate unicorn's horn, a speaking-trumpet, and other mathematical instruments," and "the jaw of an unknown, but pro-



digious large fish;" or that Thoresby was deputed "with Mr. Neville, Cousin Cookson, and others of the Grand Jury, to see a reputed witch, who, though aged, could not repeat the Lord's Prayer, a fit instrument for Satan." The taste of that connoisseur will not be much regarded, who informs us that among the pictures at Hampton Court, "the celebrated Cartoons done by the famous *Michael Angelo* and *Cæsar's Triumphs* exceed the rest;" and who immediately adds, in the same breath, "though that of *King William on horseback*, by *Sir Godfrey Kneller*, is a masterpiece." Of his imperturbable good-nature no man can doubt, who notes the equanimity with which he expresses himself concerning two printers, one of whom could never be kept sober till the other was got out of bed; or the resignation with which he attended Mr. Harper to "the eating a barrel of oysters at a tavern, though I loved them not." Finally, all must acknowledge, that it was no common spirit of devotion which could prompt a man on a summer's evening walk from "St. Mary-le-Bon" (at that time a remote suburban district,) to occupy himself "in an agreeable solitude, singing psalms in the silent fields;" or, at a yet later season of life, when prevented by sickness from attending church on Sunday, and when his infirmity was so great that he was forced every quarter of an hour to lie down, "at intervals to read *five* of Mr. Blair's Sermons on the Beatitudes." In order to obviate any suspicion of anachronism, it may be necessary to signify, that the Blair here mentioned, is not the more recent Dr. Adam Blair, (five of whose whipped-syllabub sermons consecutively are not likely to prove very remedial), but Mr. James Blair, M. A., President of William and Mary College, in Virginia, whose excellent Discourses, as we are informed in a note, were published in 1728, in five volumes octavo.

Neither is our difficulty terminated when we have recourse to the Letters. By so doing, indeed, we but exchange the dog for the wolf; for although the list of Thoresby's correspondents presents a galaxy of names brilliant when collected, any one of them, taken separately from his companions, affords but a very pitiful twinkling; and it is with surprise that we are compelled to admit what very little things may be written by persons of repute in their generation. Lhwyd (the archaeologist), Ray (the naturalist), Bishops Nicholson, Gibson, Kennet, and Burnet; Woodward, Hickes, Matthew Henry, Strype, Hearne, Edmund Calamy, Thomas Baker, Sir Hans Sloane, Roger Gale, Peter le Neve, Derham, Arthur Collins, George Vertue, and Mrs. Elizabeth Elstob, each and all are correspondents whose familiar communi-



cations any man might very justly think worth preserving. To Thoresby himself, and to his family, they were deservedly of value as testimonies of much honourable friendship. That at the decease of those most interested in them, they did not journey at once *in vicum vendentem thus et odores*, may be attributed to the indolence or to the pardonable scrupulosity of executors; and that when, after having been consecrated by the mouldiness and yellowness of more than a century, they presented some of the above indorsements to a collector's eye, they should find their way into a National Museum, is scarcely a matter of great surprise; but it really *does* greatly surprise us, and our astonishment is most unbounded, that their contents should ever have found their way *again out* of that Museum, embodied in two very fair and goodly octavos; and the bulimia of the Public for everything new and authentic, and "now first published from the originals," be its quality what it may, must far exceed our estimate of it, if the very respectable publishers have not found reason to lament their rash speculation.

But we must hunt for a few plums, and the first which occurs to us is a Scriptural commentary from the pen of Mrs. Elizabeth Bland, a lady who could read Hebrew fluently into English.

"Beeston, April 22, 1716.

"MR. THORESBY—Much esteemed friend, I beg pardon for my long detaining the ingenious Mrs. Elstob's books; the grammar part of one of them I have copied, which may be one part of my excuse, and the other is, the perusing of your pleasing and informing book of the topography of Leeds. In the appendix, where you are writing of the longevity of men, I observe that you, as well as the generality of both learned and unlearned, take the sense of psalm xc. ver. 10, to be the stated time of man's life in a general way, in that age, and also in this; but, with submission to the learned, and begging pardon for my boldness in venturing to differ from so general an opinion, my thoughts are: that psalm, as several of our expositors do take it to be, was made on, or for a lamentation upon that defection, upon which they were turned back to wander forty years in the wilderness, after they had been numbered from twenty years old and upwards; and of that great number, but two were to live more than forty years; so that those of thirty, when numbered, if they should live to the end, could be but seventy; and those of forty, but eighty, which Moses seems to lament very sore, and calleth it a cutting off, which plainly seems to intimate that he did not think it to be the full time of life of those men, or of that generation; and if the verse be attentively read, it will appear that he thought them to be in their strength when eighty years of age, as we find Caleb telling the next generation he was, and therefore not to be thought the fixed time of life of either that or this age; and if the translators had so considered it, they might, from the original, have worded it somewhat more plain.

“ Dear sir, excuse my prattle, and accept of my sincere respects, and please to present the same to your good wife, from your much obliged friend and servant,  
ELIZABETH BLAND.”

“ Beeston, April 30, 1716.

“ MR. THORESBY—I must not presume to translate, but, to oblige you, herewith I send you an interlineari of the words as they stand in three verses of that psalm; but the stress of my sentiment lay, in its not being Moses’s intent to tell us what was the general length of men’s lives, but lamenting them that at those years were cut off; and so it may be applicable in all ages to such as are cut off, whether at a longer or shorter time, as the Scriptures inform us, both the righteous and the wicked are, for reasons best known to the wise Father of all. If it be any way acceptable to you, it is very pleasant to me to be thus employed, who am

“ Your friend and servant, ELIZABETH BLAND.”

*Letters*, vol. ii. p. 352, 354.

The training for orders described below is not such as many Divines have undergone. Yet the *Subaltern* Edmund Hickeringill, who relates it of himself, became a very useful Parish Priest, and a voluminous theological writer, for he enumerates in the postscript to the very letter from which our extract is taken, not less than eighteen Works, as *some* of the books composed by him.

“ I was born September 17, 1631, and was the third son of Mr. Edmund Hickeringill, of Aberford, in Yorkshire, by Frances, (his second wife,) the daughter of Dr. Edmund Troutbeck, of Hope-hall, in Bramham, in the county of York, and I was admitted a pensioner in St. John’s College, in Cambridge, anno 1646, and chosen to be fellow of Gonville and Caius College, in Cambridge, anno 1650; but Mars being lord of my ascendant, which gave me a very strong and robust constitution, Mercury also being well dignified, I accepted at first a commission to be a lieutenant in Colonel Daniel’s regiment, in Scotland, under General Monk, governor of Scotland, and was afterwards governor of Mackloor castle, situate on the skirts of the Highlands; but after King Charles’s forces under General Middleton were quite subdued, and a general quiet in England and Scotland, I (minding to understand foreign discipline in foreign countries) accepted a commission for captain in Major-General Fleetwood’s regiment (then Swedish ambassador to Oliver Cromwell,) and marrying a Swedish woman, was a naturalized Swede; under whose command I marched my company, consisting of 125 private soldiers, besides officers, which I raised in and about Aberford, where I was born, and parts adjacent, in fourteen days’ time, beating up my drums at York, Halifax, Leeds, &c., of which parish of Leeds, Mr. Walker (my lieutenant) was a native, and shipping my men at Hull, in Yorksbire, we landed at Hamburgh in four days’ time, the King of Sweden’s resident in Hamburgh furnishing us with clothes, money, and arms. Thence I was commanded to march to Stod’t, on the south side of the river Elbe; and soon after I was made governor of Buckstabo, a Swedish garrison in Bremen, a territory in Germany, anciently belonging to the Kings of

Sweden ; at least, ever since the reign of Gustavus Adolphus, uncle to King Carolus Gustavus, who designing to invade Denmark, anno 1657, and having newly intermarried with the youngest daughter of the Duke of Holstein, a lady of incomparable beauty, and grandmother to this present King of Sweden, whose father (her only child) was not then born ; when King Carolus Gustavus rendezvoused all his forces in Germany, at Kiel (a seaport upon the Baltic ocean, and metropolis of Holstein,) and amongst the rest, my company (that was equal in number with the whole regiment of the Duke of Lunenburg, with whom we were embodied) ; and, taking shipping at Kiel, the whole army landed the same day in Zealand, at a Danish port, above twenty leagues from the chief city thereof, Copenhagen, which, with the second city of Zealand, Elsinore, we besieged at one and the same time, taking Elsinore, which fell to my lot, amongst others, at the first summons ; but the castle (called Cronenburg Castle, a most impregnable fort, three parts whereof is washed with the Baltic ocean,) held out some time ; but was at length surrendered upon articles ; but the governor was hanged as soon as he came to his king of Denmark, for a traitor, the castle being subdued with golden pistols rather than brass cannons.

“ But this strong and important fort (for it commands that small and narrow entrance into the Sound, for which cause all ships, of what nation soever, there pay tribute,) was no sooner in possession of the Swedes, but the Dutch came to relieve Copenhagen with forty stout men of war (the Swedish fleet then hovering over Copenhagen, to hinder all relief by sea,) and the command of one of the said Swedes' men-of-war (called the North Star) was given to me. Admiral Falconbridge was admiral of the Dutch fleet, and Wittee de Witt was his Vice-Admiral, whose ship with five more the Swedes took. But de Witt's ship was so shattered, and he so mortally wounded, that he died, and the ship was sunk by the Swedes in four fathom water. My skill in the theory of navigation, together with my resolute soldiers (for half of them had served with me in Scotland under General Monk,) gave us the command of that man of war. But when the peace was concluded betwixt the two northern crowns, I had but eighteen men left alive of my one hundred and twenty-five. But this gave me the practical part of navigation, and made me an absolute tarpaulin. Afterwards I grew a more accomplished mariner, by sailing to Portugal, the Canaries, Surinam, Barbadoes, St. Christopher's, Hispaniola, and Jamaica ; of which island Col. Doyley was then governor, and put into that post by the Cromwells. He for the benefit of all mariners that touch upon that coast, surrounded the island with five hundred boats, to sound the depth of the sea round that isle (an useful work, but what the Spaniards never had leisure or will to attempt,) which governor, being my intimate friend, sent his first letters to King Charles the Second, after his restoration, anno 1660, by me, and also the map of the said island of Jamaica and soundings ; which is printed in my book, called Jamaica described, which was published by the command of King Charles the Second, and to him by me dedicated : in requital whereof, that king made me secretary of state for the island of Jamaica, under the right hon. the Earl of Windsor, the first governor that King Charles the Second sent to Jamaica ; in which post I continued a

whole year; for so long it was (after his and mine entrance upon that employment) before a fleet could be equipped, in that low ebb of the exchequer, that had many vents in those days, and many hungry and long fasting expectations to glut; and before the governor's instructions were perfected by me, who drew them all: not but that the king was willing to grant him any advantage and privilege that he could reasonably demand; but the Earl knew not what to demand without my assistance, who had been (as also had been many other mariners) upon the place; but no other mariner had had that liberal education in an academy, where I kept my travelling fellowship some years after I was a soldier and mariner. During a whole year's waiting in this employment (but not without a very good stipend,) I became intimately acquainted with the famous Dr. Saunderson, then Bishop of Lincoln, who not only persuaded me to leave off rambling the world, but also persuaded me into holy orders (for which he deemed me very capable,) and to serve God and the Church of England, especially then, when so many non-conformists deserted, at that fatal Bartholomew-day, anno 1662, which gave birth to so grand a non-conformity, for which no town was more notorious than Colchester, which was the only cause why I was sent thither by concert betwixt the right reverend Fathers in God, Gilbert, Lord Bishop of London, and the said Lord Bishop of Lincoln: that there first breaking the ice, I might and must necessarily break my shins, as Bishop Sheldon (in pleasant and amicable drollery) then told me, saying it was but a just penance for my youthful pranks, in being a soldier and seaman under the two great Hectors of Europe, Oliver Cromwell and Carolus Gustavus, King of Sweden. And some that know Colchester very well, have wondered that I should continue forty years a minister in Colchester, which none else ever did, but were (much sooner) either starved or stormed out of that notorious as well as populous town: and others, also, (that know not my temper) have admired that the devil (of avarice and ambition) should never tempt me to endeavour to climb to the pinnacles of the temple; but as I came not into the priest's office that I might get a piece of bread, but to enjoy (what I value above any thing in this world) a happy retirement from the noise and gaudy turmoil of the world, of which I have had a sufficient surfeit; having, notwithstanding, a competent temporal estate of inheritance of 250*l.* or 300*l.* per annum, enough for my seven children (which are all men and women grown, and already well provided for) if they be good, and too much if they prove bad, of which I have hitherto had no cause of jealousy."—*Letters*, vol. ii. p. 10—14.

We find scattered up and down these pages a few notices of the early proceedings of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, as connected with the establishment of the bounties of Philip Lord Wharton, which Thoresby dispensed at Leeds. These are not without interest; and on the principle that much may be learned by our knowing that which we ought to eschew, we shall take our leave by commending to the notice of the Commissioners for building and enlarging churches, a single architec-

tural commentary, transmitted to Thoresby by the Rev. Joseph Cookson, the vicar of his native town.

"Our new church is got four yards high, so that you will be pleasantly surprised at your return. Our altar-piece is further adorned, since you went, with three flower-pots upon three pedestals, upon the wainscot, gilt; and a hovering dove upon the middle one; three cherubs over the middle panel, the middle one gilt, and a piece of open carved work underneath, going down towards the middle of the velvet: but the greatest ornament is a choir, well filled with devout communicants; which has put our gentlemen, particularly our good friend Mr. Milner, upon proposing a double row of fixed seats, for the greater convenience: but for the present, we have ordered double moveable benches, with a rail in the middle. I pray God still to increase our numbers, it will be the best means to continue us a happy and a flourishing people. My spouse is somewhere in or about London, you may hear of her at the Hen and Chickens, at Fleet-street. Dr. Ibbetson went up last Wednesday. I must congratulate you upon Bishop Gibson's advancement: I hope it will be for your son's interest. The ladies of Ledstone enquired after you last Wednesday.

"Mr. Robinson, I hear, is for Buxton this week; I design to see him this afternoon, and then shall remind him of what you write. Mrs. Thoresby is very hearty and desires her love, and your son and daughter their duty. Mrs. Whichcote desires her service, and I am, sir,

"Your affectionate humble servant, JOSEPH COOKSON."

—*Letters*, vol. ii, p. 383—385.

Three gilt flower-pots, one gilt cherub, and a hovering dove!

*Alipedes habet arte truces, aurumque figuris  
Terribile!*

ART. VIII.—1. *The Analogy of Revelation and Science established, in a Series of Lectures delivered before the University of Oxford, in the year 1833, on the foundation of the late Rev. John Bampton, M. A., Canon of Salisbury.* By Frederick Nolan, LL.D. F.R.S. Vicar of Prittlewell, Essex, and formerly Student of Exeter College, Oxford.—Oxford, Parker; Rivingtons, and Boone, London. 1833.

2. *Revelation and Science.* By the Rev. Baden Powell, M. A. F. R. S., of Oriel College; Savilian Professor of Geometry.—Oxford, Parker; London, Rivingtons, 1833.

3. *The Cabinet Cyclopædia.—Natural Philosophy: An historical View of the Progress of the Physical and Mathematical Sciences, from the earliest Ages to the present Times.* By the Rev. Baden Powell, M. A. F. R. S., Savilian Professor of Geometry in the University of Oxford. London, Longman and Co.; and Taylor. 1834.

4. *A Popular View of the Correspondency between the Mosaic Ritual and the Facts and Doctrines of the Christian Religion : in nine Discourses.* By the Rev. William Greswell, M. A., Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford, and Officiating Curate of Disley in the county of Chester. London: Rivingtons. 1834.

*Cm. f* SINCE the date of our last publication we have looked with more care, because at more leisure, over the Bampton Lectures of Dr. Nolan, and Mr. Powell's sermon, reprinted in reply. Other productions also, the titles of two of which we have prefixed to this article, have been put forth with a greater or less bearing upon the question. It seems probable, that a regular and important controversy will arise; and that it will be long and fiercely maintained. If we consulted our own ease, we should abstain from taking any share in it whatever: but, without wishing to refer to the skirmishes, of which some periodical works have already been the scene, we do not feel at liberty to slip entirely out of the fray, because our interference may not be of a kind altogether acceptable to either of the parties engaged.) The matter is far too momentous to be regarded with indifference, either real or pretended; and the only hope of a satisfactory adjustment, is in the intervention of moderate persons, who have not committed themselves to any particular theory, or lashed themselves up into a fury of intemperance by the process and the warmth of their previous exertions.

Our wish, therefore, is to act rather as umpires than as combatants. We hope at least that we shall be able to disentangle the dispute from some of its perplexities, to disencumber it of some of its difficulties: and in reference to Mr. Powell, with whom we are chiefly concerned, to put it upon its proper footing. Entertaining these views, we shall speak as calmly, as briefly, and as temperately as we can, without fear and without favour.

The dignity of the Bampton Lectures demands that we should begin with Dr. Nolan. He explains the object of his discourses in the following words:

"Of Revelation it has been justly observed, that it properly consists in a history of God's dealings with mankind; according to the order in which the events recorded in it are detailed, the distribution of the subject has been consequently effected. After the introductory Lecture, in which it is opened, and the principles on which the investigation is conducted, are explained; the discussion is prosecuted according to the order observed in detailing the incidents of the sacred history, of which the Creation and Deluge are the most prominent. Occasion is accordingly taken to pursue the investigation through the different sciences, to which there is any allusion in Scripture. In this manner all that is recorded of the planetary system,—of the earth, its formation, and submersion in a deluge,—of the method in which it has



been supplied with living creatures,—and particularly of the nature and destination of man, to whose dominion it has been committed—is discussed in order. In the course of the subjects thus investigated, the philosophy of the Scriptures is fully examined; and the common objections arising from the existing state of astronomy, geology, physiology, psychology, philology, &c. specifically answered.”—*Nolan*, Preface, pp. xiii. xiv.

By the way, in making an extract from the preface, we cannot but express our regret at the extreme soreness of spirit in which its concluding paragraphs are written; and also at the tone of irritation and asperity which occasionally betrays itself in the notes.

It would be a labour, neither very pleasant nor very profitable, to discuss, even if we could accurately make out, the particular theories propounded by Dr. Nolan, throughout the large range of science which his lectures embrace. A single quotation from the first will give a sufficient specimen of the style, and may, perhaps, explain the temper in which the task is undertaken; although, as to the exact views of the writer, it still manages to leave us in a mist.

“It has been found, by sad experience, that from no quarter has Revelation suffered so deeply in its credit, as from opposing Science. The inspired narrative, in the detail of ordinary events, bears impressed upon it the stamp of unimpeachable veracity. But in touching upon subjects relating to science, its descriptions, as accommodated to the obvious appearance of things, maintain but little regard to philosophical precision, in the advanced state of our present knowledge. The charge or suspicion of error being thus incurred by the sacred record, the claim which it lays to infallibility must be proportionably shaken. The broad line, by which truth and error are separated, thus becoming in some measure obliterated; the confidence necessarily fails which we repose in the guide, that had been chosen as our unerring director. All that bears the air of the marvellous, in its deviation from natural truth, is necessarily opposed to science; and when estimated by this standard, incurs the imputation of error. As the inspired record derives chiefly, if not exclusively, from the marvellous, the proof of its divine original; when that character is impeached or forfeited, the authority is undermined, which qualifies it to become the undeviating rule of our opinions and practice.

“It can be scarcely necessary to push our observations from these pernicious principles to the practical evils to which they progressively lead; or to point out, by how easy and regular a descent the path is smoothed from scepticism to open immorality. The last age which vaunted itself in its superior philosophical light, which employed its most strenuous efforts to subvert all religion, by demonstrating its irreconcilable opposition to scientific truth, gave full proof of the corrupt fruits, of which a soil so noxious is naturally productive. The



last consequence of these endeavours, as a neighbouring nation, not long since, learned to their misfortune, was not merely to loosen the obligations, but to sever the moral ties, by which the social and domestic interests of humanity are preserved from dissolution. Their avowed object was to strip Revelation not only of its highest truths, but to despoil it of its divine authority; to hold it up to the contempt and execration of the multitude, as a scheme of imposture fitted only for the superstitious and hypocritical. They laboured, not without effect, to supersede it by a philosophical system, better suited in their views to the reason and happiness of mankind; and of the moral tendencies of which an estimate may be readily formed, as it left them unfettered in their choice, between a stoical mortification on the one hand, and an epicurean licentiousness on the other."—*Nolan*, p. 3—5.

In short, of Dr. Nolan's volume we scarcely know what to say. His head seems to contain more than he knows exactly how to manage. His lectures are learned, but, unfortunately, they are almost unreadable; they display large stores of various information, but that information seems ill assorted, and sometimes almost obsolete; and his views are delivered, for the most part, in a style so pedantic and elaborate, that it rather tends to confuse the mind with a conglomeration of words, than to convey to it any notions clear and precise, and accurately defined. If we look to some single sentences, we find the vicar of Prittlewell no more an advocate for a *literal* interpretation of the Mosaic record, than the Savilian professor himself; but then, unless he is an advocate for such an interpretation, the general tenor of his discourses becomes altogether vague and unintelligible.

We turn, then, to Mr. Baden Powell, and we shall speak of his tenets more at large, not so much because he was trained in sounder principles, and would have acted wisely in clinging to them; not so much because his opinions present a strange phenomenon in the atmosphere of Christian doctrines; not so much because baneful latitudinarianisms such as his ought, if it be possible, to be strangled in their cradle, as because he seems to put himself forward against Dr. Nolan, as the representative of a new class of liberal and philosophical divines; and because he has clothed his sentiments in plainer and bolder language than any other champion of the same school has yet ventured to use.

That these sentiments may not be misrepresented, they shall be at once stated in his own language. In his discourse he tells us, with regard to the Mosaic record,

"There are extraordinary appearances and occurrences mentioned in some parts of the narrative, which are referred to as signal manifestations of the Divine power, whether in saving or destroying. There are references to the history of early nations, to the distribu-

tion of the tribes of the human race, to the physical history of man; there may be, in a word, allusions and references more or less direct to a variety of points connected with the different branches of human knowledge; and in all which the results of diligent enquiry and philosophical research may exhibit either a conformity or contradiction to the terms of the description. But upon these we shall have no occasion to dwell in detail. The main principle is what we are chiefly concerned with. And that main principle, which it is my object to maintain, is this: *That neither is the existence of these absolute contradictions any argument against the truth of Revelation in general, or the Christian religion in particular; nor are the accordances which may be made out necessary to its support,*"—*Powell's Rev.* p. 10, 11.

"The sacred writers convey their doctrines through the medium of history, of fiction, of poetry, or of argument, as well as direct precept. Their subject may involve incidental references to the facts of the natural world: and these they would of course present under that aspect in which they were commonly contemplated by the persons they were addressing. Their allusions would have failed in being a channel of communication, had they been led to depart from such a mode of representation. They might refer either to the sensible appearances of nature, or to the traditional belief respecting its mode of origination, or its subsequent revolutions.

"If we look at the actual case of the writings of Moses, it is surely in every way the most probable supposition, that tradition had preserved some legendary memorials of primæval events, and that the origin of the world had been recorded in a poetical cosmogony. As introductory to the revelation of the law, Moses then put a *religious application* upon such memorials for the stronger sanction of the enactments of that law to the Israelites; and adopted them for the illustration of religious truths, and as the vehicles of moral instruction to the chosen people.

"But whatever may be thought of such suppositions, on the broad considerations before advanced, the rational enquirer will surely at once *dismiss* the subject of the alleged physical contradictions. And when we look at the variety of attempts which are made to gloss over the difficulty, to torture texts into accordance, to supply plausible hypotheses by which we imagine the facts in some manner accommodated to the description, or to disparage the authority on which the facts are stated, we cannot but regard all this as a most lamentable waste of time and ingenuity, grounded upon a radical misconception of the entire nature and design of Revelation."—*Powell's Rev.* p. 14, 15.

From these extracts two things appear unquestionable. The one is, that Mr. Powell is inclined to throw overboard not merely the *verbal* and *literal* accuracy of the scriptural narrative, but its general and substantial truth in *any* intelligible sense of the word. The other is, that there is nothing original in his views; inasmuch as the theory, that Moses has merely picked up the "*waifs and strays*" of old floating traditions, and interwoven them with his history, was a favorite doctrine of Voltaire and his

disciples, and furnished frequent matter for their ribald jests. And as the French philosophers have preceded Mr. Powell in some of his opinions, certain German theologians will be found to have anticipated him in others.

But it may be said, that Mr. Powell puts these sentiments hypothetically, and for the sake of argument. We answer, that the supposition is bad enough; but that, in fact, the disguise, which was transparent from the first, is afterwards thrown off, and that the real nature of his individual opinions soon slips out from under the thin cloak of pretended hypothesis. Does not the following passage from the notes make the thing manifest?

“ I had entertained some notion of adding a few remarks on the various publications which are now obtaining a considerable popularity, under the well-meant and specious plea of attempting (as they call it) to reconcile Science and Revelation, the physical with the scriptural philosophy; but I shall not pursue the subject into any detail. Attempts dictated by the same *mistaken* spirit have been common from the first dawn of experimental philosophy. From the days of Galileo, when Foscarinus published his ingenious reconciliation of the motion of the earth with Scripture by means of refined glosses and interpretations put upon the opposing texts; and from the period when Tycho Brahe contrived a new system of the universe with the same object; (the one torturing the letter of Scripture into agreement with facts, the other inventing a view of the facts to accord with the letter of Scripture;) the very same spirit has been continually manifested, equally by the promulgation of “Moses’s Principia” and the theories of the early cosmogonists, and by the recent publications on what is termed Mosaical Mineralogy and Scriptural Geology, by Messrs. Penn, Fairholme, Higgins, *et id genus omne*.”—*Powell’s Rev.* p. 44.

With the gentlemen thus politely designated by the Savilian Professor, we repeat, once for all, that we have nothing to do. We care no more for Dr. Nolan and “*id genus omne*,” than for Mr. Powell and “*id genus omne*.” But we *do* care for the authenticity and integrity of the word of God. Mr. Powell may be justified in charging upon some of his opponents “*unhappy misapprehensions*,” and “*bigoted prejudices*,” and a desire “*to com-*

\* There may be some sympathy between Mr. Powell and Mr. Sedgwick: but we should be sorry to think that the views of the two professors were identical. At the same time, as to the latter gentleman, while we entertain the highest admiration of his eloquence, and the sincerest respect for his character and abilities, we cannot but regret the *tone* in which he has spoken of men like Mr. Turner and Mr. Fairholme, who have endeavoured, piously, if not always wisely, to reconcile the Mosaic statements with geological indications. However, to Mr. Sedgwick’s discourse, we shall probably return in our next number; and we may also take an opportunity of noticing in a more worthy manner Mrs. Somerville’s treatise on “the connexion of the Physical Sciences.” The name, by the way, strikes us as unhappy, if not inapplicable: for the work is rather a string of lucid observations, written in a simple and popular style, upon a variety of mathematical and physico-mathematical subjects, than a regular and systematic view of the connexion between them.

*bine and even identify heterogeneous considerations," and a primary assumption that it is "the design of Scripture to teach philosophy."* We pass no judgment upon this point. But be it so. Still, although extremes beget extremes, extremes cannot justify extremes. Mr. Powell may be right against Dr. Nolan; we only contend that he is wrong against the Bible—just as Cæsar's cause was said to be right against Pompey, and wrong against his country.)

But Mr. Powell's Discourse is not the only place in which his opinions are stated. Mr. Powell is ambitious in their behalf. He is not contented to put them forth from the pulpit of an orthodox university, and commit, as far as he can, the theology of Oxford to his peculiar doctrines; but he studiously takes occasion to repeat them in his "History of Natural Philosophy," lately published as one of the volumes of Dr. Lardner's Cyclopædia. In speaking of Galileo and his times, and the "reception of the new discoveries by the Church," he informs us—

"Thus, however, was the Church arrayed in mortal hostility against science, and thus ineffectual was that hostility."

Again—

"Thus the monk attempted to bend Scripture to fact, and the Protestant to bend fact to Scripture; but both attempts were equally futile. The orthodox expositions of Foscarinus are unknown, and the pious theory of Tycho is exploded and forgotten; the Copernican heresy has triumphed; yet the essential truths of Revelation stand unimpeached and unimpeachable on the rock of their proper moral evidence; whilst natural theology has found, in this very system, the most powerful of all its arguments. But still are there not actual contradictions? and how are we to get over them?"—*Cab. Cyclop.* p. 186.

"In a word, the *object* of Revelation is of a kind entirely distinct from the inculcation of science; and the *incidental* parts of any book must, in all common reason and fairness, be regarded in a totally different light from its *essential* points.

"But it will be said, no one now doubts the truth of the solar system; nor is any one led to reject Revelation on the ground of its being at variance with it.

"Yet the fact is, the very same difficulties and objections are still alleged by many at the present day; not, indeed, with regard to the solar system, which they (very inconsistently) admit, but in reference to the discoveries in other parts of science, and especially in geology. We have, at the present day, zealots animated by as bitter a spirit of persecution, though happily without the power of exercising it, as those of the Roman tribunal. We have also, '*mutato nomine*,' our Tycho and Foscarinus; but we shall profit little by the experience of history if we do not learn to avoid the errors of that period; and we shall assuredly find the very same principles, so eloquently advocated by Galileo, to be

those which alone can effectually secure either religion or science from abuse and perversion."—pp. 187, 188.

Very similar to this extract is a passage from the notes to his Discourse.

"When there is a physical impossibility for understanding a passage of Scripture in its literal sense, we are necessitated either to leave it without interpretation, or to understand it in some figurative sense.

"Thus, e. g. all Protestants admit, that as our Lord's words, 'This is my body,' cannot be understood in a literal sense, they must be taken in a metaphorical. In like manner, all rational interpreters allow that the expressions of the earth's quiescence and the sun's motion are physically and literally untrue, and must therefore be understood in some other sense. On precisely the same principle, every one who knows anything of geology is aware that there exists precisely the same physical impossibility for understanding the first chapter of Genesis in its literal sense. It must, therefore, (on the same ground) be understood in some other sense. The cases are absolutely identical. The man who maintains the letter of the Mosaic cosmogony, ought, by parity of reason, to believe in the Ptolemaic system and in transubstantiation."—p. 46.

Now here, although we may break the thread of our observations, we cannot but allow ourselves two or three passing remarks as to either the want of candour or the confusion of ideas exhibited by Mr. Powell. When he speaks, as he does in several places, of a *literal* sense as opposed to a *figurative* sense, we would ask him what he can possibly mean by a *figurative* sense as applied to the plain statement of an historical fact; for instance, the creation of mankind from a single pair? We would ask him, again, with what colour of justice he can confound an acquiescence in his principles with an acquiescence in the principles maintained by Galileo? We do not impugn the veracity of Moses, whose *language* we allow to be *popular*, and not *scientific*, by asserting that he attributed an *absolute* motion to the sun in regard to our earth, instead of a *relative* motion; for we still speak in the same manner every day of our lives. But the case is altogether different, if we impute to him *absolute contradictions*, which are, in other words, positive falsehoods, which, in no sense, and by no interpretation, can be true. The other instance of transubstantiation, adduced as a case in point, is a simple absurdity.

Mr. Powell's is, in fact, a new and very curious theory of biblical interpretation. Nay, so extraordinary is this theory, that it is impossible to read it without feeling that neither Mr. Powell, nor any man in his senses, would have made it gratuitously; or without thinking himself as it were compelled by the stern mandate of some iron necessity. Mr. Powell insinuates the danger of asserting propositions against infidels which must be found at last untenable: does he not also perceive the weapons which he

puts into their hands, by advancing an hypothesis which no advocate would dream of advancing, unless he suspected that there was something weak and rotten in his cause; and therefore which will lead the enemies of Revelation to believe, and exult in the belief, that he merely chooses the less of two evils, as he perceives a plain contradiction between the progressive discoveries of science and the physical statements of the Scripture; or, in other words, since the statements must be allowed to be both literally and substantially false, he finds it advisable to argue that their truth or falsehood is a matter of no consequence? Mr. Powell may be well assured that his saving clauses about "*literal interpretation*" will not avail him while the general tenor of his theory remains as it is. "*Literal interpretation*"! Is this all that he opposes? Let the reader judge.

"A question has been sometimes argued on physiological grounds, respecting the probable origin of the human race; whether derived from one primæval pair, or from many; and the latter notion has been denounced as a most pernicious error, because it was imagined that it must strike a deadly blow at the doctrine of *original sin*.

"But according to the best apprehension I can form of the scriptural view of original sin, I fail in perceiving how it can be in any degree affected by such a speculation. For admitting (for the sake of argument) that the human species was originally produced in any way that the physiologist may imagine, surely the doctrine of human corruption, *as substantially taught in the New Testament*, would stand altogether unchanged. St. Paul's *eloquent analogies* might, indeed, require a modified interpretation; but neither the substantial truth, nor the necessity for spiritual and practical regeneration, and the other consequences grounded upon it, would be in the slightest degree impaired.

"Let it be observed I am not contending *for* the opinion in question, but only against the mistake of supposing, that, if sound physical reasoning did require its admission, it could be injurious to the doctrines of Christianity.

"Another case, to which somewhat similar remarks will apply, is St. Peter's reference to the Deluge, to found upon it an admonition relating to the future judgment.

"If we admit (for the sake of argument) that the Mosaic description of the Deluge is not literally borne out by the appearances which the surface of the earth presents, in what way, I ask, would that circumstance affect the practical authority of St. Peter's exhortation, when we know that the doctrine he refers to is established upon the repeated and explicit declarations, both of the other Apostles, and of our Lord himself? This particular illustration may lose somewhat of its force, but the essential truth illustrated remains utterly untouched."—*Powell's Rev.* pp. 17, 18.

Hence, if *any* logical conclusion is to be drawn, we cannot but conclude that it makes no substantial difference, whether the doctrine of original sin, as displayed in Scripture, or in the articles of



the Church of England, is true or false; whether there has been any *fall* and corruption of man, or none; or an *universal fall*, or a *partial fall*; and whether the unfallen part of the human race has intermingled and intermarried with the fallen, and the offspring are consequently of a mixed and hybrid species. It makes no difference whether the account of a general deluge, which is recorded in the Old Testament, to which our Saviour refers in the New, and which is attested by the concurrent traditions of every quarter of the globe, is to be superseded or not by the hasty generalizations of the new science of geology.

The theory *may* be correct which Mrs. Somerville puts very neatly in her treatise upon "the Connexion of the Physical Sciences."

"The traces of extreme antiquity perpetually occurring to the geologist give that information as to the origin of things in vain looked for in the other parts of the universe. They date the beginning of time with regard to our system, since there is ground to believe that the formation of the earth was contemporaneous with that of the rest of the planets; but they show that creation is the work of Him with whom 'a thousand years are as one day, and one day as a thousand years.'

"It thus appears that the theory of dynamics, founded upon terrestrial phenomena, is indispensable for acquiring a knowledge of the revolutions of the celestial bodies and their reciprocal influences."—p. 411.

We have no geological system either to advocate or to oppose. Our wish is not to arrest scientific researches, but to prevent scientific men from trampling the authority of the Bible in the dust. Our own views upon the subject may be stated in three words. Let geology, like every other study, have its free course, and proceed, unimpeded and unreviled, upon its proper path. Let a comprehensive but a candid—an unchecked, but a modest, investigation, bring it more and more to the dignity and stability of a fixed and ascertained science; and when it is fixed and ascertained, then, and not before, let us impartially examine how far its results can be adjusted to the Mosaic record;—what latitude of interpretation may have been rendered necessary;—and what degree of correctness or error may be found in the cosmogony of the Pentateuch. In the meantime, let the antagonist parties refrain from acrimonious sneers and uncharitable imputations. Let not Divine and human knowledge be arrayed against each other; or reason and revelation be misrepresented as enemies, with an equal injury to both. The fair issue we are contented to abide; and we abide it without an apprehension. We only say, let it not be precipitated. We only deprecate rash, and premature, and fatal admissions, before the stream of geology has worked itself clear, and while the inquiries of one writer overthrow



the theories of his predecessor, to be overthrown in their turn by the further researches of a third.)

We quite allow, that geology has come as a fresh and unexpected card into the hands of the infidel. But when we consider, that it is a comparatively new science—a science which has scarcely past its stout and vigorous infancy:—when we reflect that of the eight thousand miles which constitute the diameter of the earth, man has pierced to the depth only of one or two:—that at the most, therefore, his incisions into its giant frame are but skin deep, and his knowledge of its vast anatomy comparatively less than if an empiric should scratch a human body with a pin, and, upon the strength of such a dissection, begin to fancy himself a John Hunter or an Astley Cooper; it is evident, that as yet there are no sufficient data on which positive and dictatorial opinions can be built; and that the conclusions of geology far outrun its premises, whenever it is used as an instrument to overthrow or shatter the credibility of Revelation. The whole structure of our globe must be stirred and turned inside out; its central abysses must be bared to view; and its very bowels must reveal secrets fatal to our faith, before a wise man will suffer geological deductions to impair or disturb his belief in Christianity.

At the same time, we are also most ready to allow that Mr. Powell's plan of denying that the Scriptural facts have any bearing upon the Scriptural doctrines, is the easiest and most expeditious of all conceivable methods—we will not say for solving all the intricacies of the problem, but for removing all present, and obviating all future difficulties. Unfortunately, however, to any such course there are these insuperable objections. It goes against the plain truth and reason of the matter: it weakens the evidences of our religion, and strips it of some of its most valuable peculiarities: and the creation and origin of man, as well as the whole scheme of God's moral government, and the special interference of his Almighty Providence in the direction of human affairs it again envelopes in a thick mantle of impenetrable darkness. It simplifies Revelation by half doing it away. It sweeps off any embarrassments which may occur in the writings of Moses, not by merely allowing that his forms of *language* were of necessity adapted to rude and unscientific times, but by treating the substantial veracity of the whole physical record as a thing of indifference. These we have asserted to be monstrous and heretical propositions. We adhere to the terms. In making the charge of heresy we use the term precisely in the sense which Dr. Johnson assigns to it, and in which it is sometimes peculiarly applicable to the exclusive and self-complacent lawgivers of a college

common-room, namely, "*as an opinion of private men different from that of the Catholic and Orthodox Church.*" Upon this point, however, we shall touch but very slightly, because we feel that it might *seriously* affect Mr. Powell, not as a geologist, not as a mathematician, not as a Savilian professor, but as a divine, and a minister of the Church of England. Let us merely state, in two words, that Mr. Powell's propositions are heretical; 1st, Because they contradict the express letter of the Scriptures; and 2dly, Because they set at defiance all esteemed and authorized expounders of the Scriptures; whether councils or individuals, compilers of articles, or founders of sects. The New Testament, it is evident, every where supposes the exact, undeviating and uniform truth of the Old. Our Saviour read and explained and listened to it in the Temple: he referred to it, as containing testimonies of himself, both before his death and after his resurrection; and we challenge the production of an instance in which there is a shadow of exception made, or distinction drawn, as to the perfect and invariable veracity of its subject-matter. If "*all Scripture,*" as we are told, "*is given by inspiration of God:*" if St. Peter, nay, Jesus Christ himself, adverts to the Noachian deluge, not as a fiction, but as a recognised fact: if the great and all-gracious scheme of Atonement for the sins of the whole world, is unintelligible, unless we presuppose the fall and corruption of the entire species in the person of one federal head, one common parent and representative; for, as St. Paul expresses it, "*as in Adam all died, even so in Christ must all be made alive:*" then it is needless, and assuredly it is most painful to proceed; but it does appear to us, that there is no continental neology, no German rationalism, we had almost said, no English Unitarianism, which contains anything wilder and more unscriptural than this theory printed and reprinted by Mr. Powell.

We had marked out several quotations from Tomline, from the volume of Pitet, just translated into English; and from several other commentators upon the Articles of our Church, as well as upon the text of the Bible: but we are unwilling to press hard upon Mr. Powell with respect to the heterodoxy or rather heresy of his opinions. We would simply ask him to point out one single writer, reputed as orthodox, who has held the theory which he advocates; for, as far as we are acquainted with divines of weight and credit, we find, either that they never dream of entering upon such a controversy, and never even suspect the existence of such notions as those put forward by Mr. Powell; or, if the suspicion of their existence does cross their minds, they repudiate and abjure them with wonder at their extravagance, no less than expostulation against their perniciousness. Or, if Mr.

Powell would appeal from authority to reason, we would ask himself what kind of moral geology *that* must be, which has a primitive substratum of falsehood and folly with layers of truth, and inspiration, and righteousness, and Divine wisdom superimposed? And are not all our ideas—we say not merely of Moses—but even of the Deity, confused and outraged, if we conceive the Jewish lawgiver, coming from an alleged communication with Jehovah to palm childish errors upon his countrymen, just as Numa came from pretended interviews with the nymph Egeria, or Mahomet from his private conversations with the angel Gabriel? Surely, Mr. Powell must himself see that his theory strikes at the very root of all rational belief in a volume which lays claim to inspiration; and opens two doors, the one for the most latitudinarian hardihood in tampering with the letter and spirit of the Scriptures, the other for that blind and enthusiastic faith, which either dreads or despises all close and logical investigation. If words have any meaning; if the oracles of the living God are not as false, as vague, as designedly ambiguous as the oracles of a Pythian priestess; if the authenticity of the Scriptures is not a dream; if truth and falsehood are still as incompatible with each other as light and darkness, and cannot by any moral chemistry be fused or amalgamated together; Mr. Powell's hypothesis can never be sustained. Moses must either have known his statements to be false, *or not*. In either case he is no longer entitled to credit. He is convicted either of ignorance or bad faith. In all points, his claims to Divine inspiration are demolished; in some, even his claims to personal veracity.

Mr. Powell's propositions, then, do certainly seem to us heretical, if they are tried by the test of Scripture, (and we know of no other test which is admissible in the case,) whether by the letter of the Old Testament, or the sanction afforded to it in the New; and we moreover assert, that, upon all general principles, they are quite "*monstrous*" in the unreasonableness of their logic. In dealing with this topic, we shall go as little as may be possible again over the old ground; but the two points are so indissolubly cemented, and rest upon so many common premises, that we fear some repetition will be unavoidable.

Mr. Powell sometimes appears to have two objects in view; the one, to separate the Old from the New Testament, or, at least, "*the letter of the Mosaic records,*" from what he calls "*the simple reception of the Gospel doctrine in its unsophisticated purity;*" the other, to separate the physics of the Bible from its history and its doctrines, or, at least, what he calls the "*incidental*" parts of the inspired volume from the essential.

Upon these points we are directly at issue with him.

As to the former, he says,

"Let us only endeavour to view the matter divested of prepossession, and be disposed to regard it in the plain simplicity of the facts. We approach the New Testament with the desire of learning simply *what was* the religion inculcated by Jesus Christ and his Apostles. We acknowledge *that* volume to contain an authentic historical record of what they said and did. From this record the process of inquiry is simply that of collecting, as well as we can, what was the actual tenor of that system of religious truth which they promulgated. In doing this there is of course great discrimination required, in abstracting the truths which are universal, permanent and essential, from the various incidental particulars with which they are largely combined, arising out of the peculiar circumstances of those to whom they were immediately addressed." *Powell's Rev.* p. 21.

What, then, is to become of the Old Testament? and is not this the regular German system of accommodation and rationalism? What fixedness is left to the Scriptures? or what unity? Where is their authoritative majesty? where their inflexible sameness? where their changeless inviolability? What becomes of the old familiar expressions, "Sure as the Bible," "True as Holy Writ?" Oh how false and empty is our boast! How can the Bible have God for its author, and truth, without any mixture of error, for its subject-matter? How shall the father teach his child? how shall the poor man derive any certainty of comfort? how shall any two minds form for themselves the same scheme of divinity, or extract the same sense, even from the same passages? True it is, that by keeping the Old Testament attached to the New, we increase our difficulties; but then at the same time we add tenfold to our strength. True it is that we have a larger circuit to defend; but then, if we cannot defend it, it is not so much candour which *admonishes*, as necessity which *compels* us, to acknowledge that the smaller position becomes also indefensible. It were vain to argue with a man who denies that there are indissoluble ligaments which connect the two portions of God's word, and a thousand fibres which run from one into the other. We will not advert to the innumerable multitude of texts from the Psalms, from the Prophets, from the historical writers of the Old Testament, which are introduced by the Apostles and Evangelists, farther than to say, that, if they are only tares among the wheat, they are at least tares which cannot be separated *now*, but both must grow on together until the harvest at the end of the world; for, in point of fact, the force of the demonstration does not lie in single texts or expressions, but in the whole tenor of the two departments making up one entire and systematic dispensation. By detaching one part of these from the other, we must render both incomprehensible and unmeaning: by lopping off one, we should

destroy both, and leave both to wither on the ground! Alas! if the two great members of the same body are to be cut asunder, both must die under the unholy operation. Torn apart from the Old Testament, the Christian revelation itself becomes an abortive and mis-shapen prodigy, without unity, without plan, without congruity, without coherence—an end without a beginning—a consummation without a commencement—an effect without a cause. The veracity of Jesus Christ presupposes the veracity of Moses and the Prophets. The truth of the New Testament involves in it the truth of the Old, because the latter part of a system must take for granted the authority and sanctity of all that has gone before it. The Christian stands pledged to all which he holds in common with the Jew, as the Mahometan stands pledged to all which he holds in common with both Jews and Christians; although there is no contradiction implied if they who embrace the former part of a scheme, refuse to admit the latter as its adjunct or appendix. *Ultimately*, therefore, there may be as much folly and as much crime; but, upon *antecedent* grounds, the Jew, who rejects the Gospel, is not guilty of the same monstrous inconsistency as the Christian, who pretends that he has nothing to do with Judaism. When a foundation is given, there is no necessary absurdity in saying that a wrong superstructure has been built upon it; but when men would detach the building from the foundation on which it is erected, they rush to the insane, and indeed almost inconceivable error, of supposing a superstructure which rests upon itself.

We, however, are reluctant to imagine that Mr. Powell can entertain the faintest wish to separate the New Testament from the Old; yet it seems but too plain that he *does* desire to separate the physics of the Bible from the history, and the history from the doctrines. Now we hold it, on the contrary, as a peculiar glory of the Bible, that it is not a mere exhibition of tenets which cannot be submitted to any actual test of truth or falsehood; for such things are, after all, matters of opinion or taste; but that its doctrines are connected with a series of facts, which are for ever open to demonstration or disproof. We may feel an internal conviction, potent indeed, and uneradicable, that doctrines are excellent and perfect, or pernicious and abominable; but we can *prove* nothing but facts, or doctrines only by the intervention of facts. To insinuate, therefore, that the physical facts, which are the very framework of the doctrines, may be poetical amplifications, or traditional fictions, or in any way contradictory to the truth, is to display the doctrines as not merely *unproven*, but *disproven*; is not merely to leave them without support, but to demolish them and lay them prostrate; because they must stand or fall, together

with the facts with which they are bound up. For are they not bound up? What line even can we draw? How can we even say where the physical facts end and the doctrinal points begin? Are we to allow the divine authority of the commandments, and to deny the thunders and the signs with which their promulgation was accompanied? Almost all history is a history of physical facts—almost all prophecy is a prophecy of physical facts; and if miracles are not physical facts, what are they? A very large part of the Bible is an account of the divine intervention in producing physical occurrences—sometimes of the most stupendous and gigantic description—sometimes of a minute and almost familiar kind. Are we to believe what God is reported to have said, and disbelieve what God is reported to have *done*? “No,” says Mr. Powell, “but you are to draw the distinction between what is essential and what is incidental.” Is it so? Then *where* stands the arbiter with the true balance in his hand to tell us which is which? Essential and incidental! The distinction is at least idle—the terms are at least unfortunate! We deny that anything can be *unessential* in the word of Inspiration. One great design of the Mosaic record is to represent the God of Gods as speaking to us by events, and to show how he has left his handwriting on the tablet of the globe. And if we refuse to recognize the voice of God in the wonders of the Old Testament, neither can we recognize it in the visible marvels of the material universe, and the atheist may step forward and take the world to himself.

With what shadow of reason can we credit the divine *inspiration* of a book, if the narrative which it contains of the divine government and divine visitations in producing physical changes, is supposed to be fictitious? or, in general, what weight could we ever attach to a man's sentiments, if we found, that in delivering his testimony, he had falsified the facts? What should we think of such evidence, if he stood as a witness in a court of human justice? What! is the journey of the Israelites through the wilderness a legendary tale? Is the pillar of fire and of cloud a fable? Is the whole gracious array of providential interpositions, only a concerted imposture to give solemnity to the doctrines? What! we say again—Is the story of the deluge a chimera; and all that St. Peter founds upon it, with respect to the ultimate destruction of the world by fire, only another dream? Shall we turn to the withered shores of the Dead Sea, and smile with incredulity at the hand of Almighty vengeance outstretched against Sodom and Gomerrah? Then has the fiery rain *not* fallen? and were the plagues never heavy upon the land of Pharaoh, for the rebellious obstinacy of its king? And the holy lessons, the solemn warnings, the tremendous admonitions, which these occur-



rences were intended to convey to us; and to all men—are they nothing? or are they pious frauds? or are they tales, calculated for the meridian of a nursery, which the Halls of science must repudiate as impossible.

This point has been well put in Mr. Greswell's learned and well-reasoned volume, to which we can only afford to refer our readers with this general commendation. As to Mr. Powell, and his plan of distinguishing the natural philosophy of the Scriptures from the history and the doctrines, we are content to try the question by a single passage, and inquire, for instance, how he could apply his theory to the four following verses from the book of Genesis?—"The Sun was risen upon the Earth, when Lot entered into Zoar. Then the Lord rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah, brimstone and fire from the Lord out of heaven: and he overthrew those cities, and all the plain, and all the inhabitants of the cities, and that which grew upon the ground. But his wife looked back from behind him, and she became a pillar of salt."—Genesis, c. xix. v. 23—26. Or, what will Mr. Powell say to the account in the sixth chapter of Judges—as the dew came, or was forbidden to come, upon the fleece of Gideon?

Our argument then is this: the facts of a sacred history, whether physical or historical, cannot be separated from the doctrines without irreparable mischief to both. Our religion could never have gained, and could never maintain its ground, if its doctrines had no external evidence to support them. But of what external evidence is the case susceptible, but the evidence of sensible facts? therefore, if the facts are demolished, what becomes of the doctrines? Why, if the facts sink, they must pull down the doctrines with them, into a bottomless abyss of perdition and disgrace. The childish and monstrous cosmogonies, the absurd and incredible histories which are inserted in those Persian and Indian writings which profess to be sacred, we turn, and with reason, into a decisive and irrefragable testimony against their pretensions. The physical and historical prodigies which the bold mendacity of Mohammed has mixed up with the Koran, we use in the same manner. We cannot then, in common fairness, refuse to submit the Bible to a test, by which we demonstrate the falsehood of rival creeds. If we *do* refuse, the infidel will know how to take advantage of our refusal. But our belief is, that the Bible *may* appeal with confidence to the test, which no other religion can endure. And one part *may*, and *must* appeal, as well as another. We cannot pick and choose in the Old Testament, more than we can separate our hope of immortality from the physical fact of our Saviour's resurrection; or than we can affirm the crucifixion to be true, but the miraculous dark-

ness, and the accompanying convulsions of nature, to be mere accessory fictions, metaphorically introduced to heighten the awful interest.

On the same principles of reasoning, the distinction between unessential " and " incidental " must fall to the ground ; or otherwise we must drop the claim to inspired wisdom, and take a much lower tone with respect to the contents of Scripture altogether. Yet more : these incidental points, be it remembered, form the very commencement of the sacred record, which, according to this hypothesis, is to start with a series of fictions. Then let us take a parallel instance from the New Testament. In the gospel of St. Matthew there is the account of the miraculous conception of our Lord, attended by preternatural occurrences, of a description purely physical. Now, the account is either a true and authentic history, or it is an interpolation, or it is a forgery by the writer himself. The two former suppositions have no bearing upon our argument ; but if we pretend that Matthew introduced the narration, by way of dignifying the after-events of our Saviour's career on earth, we do neither more nor less than destroy the credibility of the evangelist for ever. And with what colour of plausibility can we argue, that the reasoning, which is plainly incontrovertible as to the New Testament, is inapplicable to the Old ?

But there follows another instance even more in point. The Magi, we are told, saw the star of our Redeemer in the East, and came to worship him. Here, there is no necessity for supposing that the star was an enormous and solid sphere, like one of the planets, or one of the majestic orbs, which are usually designated as the fixed stars. As we allow that the language of Scripture is *popular*, and not technical and scientific language, it is quite sufficient to suppose it to have been a meteor, or some luminous appearance, having simply a degree of fixedness and consistency adequate for its intended purpose ; but if we admit the text to be genuine, and yet insinuate that there was *no* star, *no* meteor, *no* luminous appearance, *no* journey of the wise men to visit the infant Saviour, we either confuse all our ideas of common veracity, or we are compelled to disregard every succeeding statement of an historian, for whom a claim to inspiration is brought forward, but who must appear to our minds as either very foolish or very dishonest. We again say, that no line of distinction can be drawn between the different portions of the same Bible, or between the writers of the different portions ; and, instead of thus tampering with the Bible, it would be really better to say of all the statements in the Old Testament, in the widest sense, what St. Paul says, in a restricted sense, of a particular account, " Which things are an allegory."

Do we say, then, that the scriptural record is to prevent or divert a physical examination of the heavens and the earth; or, when it is made, to alter or modify its conclusions, in any manner inconsistent with the laws of just reason, or the constitution of the human understanding? No: but we do affirm, that where a previous history exists, laying claim to inspiration, it is only *rational* to take that history along with us in our excursions; and not merely to test the previous account by the actual appearances; but also to compare the actual existences with the previous account, to see how far they can be blended and harmonized. Do we suppose that it is a primary object with Revelation to teach physical science? We are guilty of no such infatuation; and gladly as we would pay the humble tribute to the wonders of physical discovery, we would not *degrade Revelation* to so unworthy an employment? Do we suppose, that the *language* of Scripture is technical and precise; in its relation to matters of science? No: We have already allowed that the *language* must be translated and accommodated by a more modern vocabulary, before there can be a literal correspondence with scientific truth. But is this to be an objection? Why, if the sacred writers had employed a technical and scientific idiom, they would have been utterly unintelligible to all whom they immediately addressed. And is it to be a valid objection against the Bible, that it uses the same forms of speech, which are still the popular language of the present day? Do we utter falsehoods, because we still speak of sun-set and sun-rise, when, in strict accuracy, the sun neither rises nor sets; or when we talk of a breeze springing up from the sea, towards the evening; although the expression may be very deficient in philosophical exactness? At one time, indeed, it was hoped by the infidel, and even feared by the believer, that the modern and the true system of astronomy would inflict a vital wound upon the cause of revealed religion. And yet, what has it done? We now find that the differences between the Mosaic account and the Newtonian theory are verbal, or little more than verbal. In the same way, physiological and zoological researches were to be fatal to the Bible. But what has been the result?—The zoological objections have been demolished, even by infidel physiologists; that the various tribes of mankind could not have come from a single pair; or that the several races of animals could not have been collected into the ark, or transplanted by separate migrations from the mountain of Asia, on which it rested, to the different regions of the earth. It may well happen that in some cases we may not as yet see the way quite clear before us; but what then? Is it not far more rational to believe, that this misfortune is owing to the state of science,

which is evidently defective, because it undergoes perpetual transitions, than to the axioms of religion, which are not alterable by man, nor progressive in the same sense as human science? We quite allow, that as religion links itself with all the sciences, so all the sciences are essential to the broadest demonstration of religion: but, if we cannot yet walk in the full daylight of that proof, there is still the rational assurance, that to suppose ourselves now capable of extricating from all embarrassment subjects so vast and complicated as to include the whole compass of physical and metaphysical knowledge, would, in fact, be to suppose ourselves capable of stepping beyond the limits which confine the human mind; and also to suppose that science has already arrived at that maturity and zenith of its splendour, to which it is only advancing by slow and painful, by gradual and toilsome steps. In the meantime, we no more anticipate destruction, or real danger to our faith, from what geology may effect—that new chronometer, which is to ascertain the age and changes of the globe—than from what astronomical and physiological researches have already effected. Our chief and only peril is from admissions at once latitudinarian and dogmatic; from propositions, false in their logic and fatal in their theology: and sure we are, that they who can now speak of physical questions, as if they were already decided against the authority of the Pentateuch, are either insidious or mad; either enemies, who wear a mask of friendship, or adherents, who know not the adamant strength of their own cause.

In a word, if God be infallible, if God be faithful, a religion which proceeds from God must be of uniform and perfect and consistent excellence; and of this at least we may be certain, that if we fling off from us one portion of his word, God will for our punishment deprive us of the blessed influences and consolations of the other. If we abandon the Old Testament, we shall be unable to maintain the New: we shall suffer our enemies to obtain possession of our strongest holds; and then, when our position is turned, and the sinews of our strength are cut away, and our artillery is spiked or pointed against ourselves, *then* we shall have to enter the contest disheartened, disabled, defenceless, and disarmed. We may allow, that some prophecies have had a kind of typical fulfilment, as where the name Emmanuel was realized in the name Jesus, or Elias came again in the person of John the Baptist; but we cannot understand a figurative explanation of facts in natural history or philosophy. We must beware of confounding the very dissimilar propositions, that the main object of the Bible is not to teach physics, or that it teaches *false* physics: that it is not, properly and primarily, a revelation

of science, or that it does reveal a system of science which is contradictory to truth. For, most assuredly, the paralogisms of divines will be exposed to the keen eye of the sceptic, and peals of the loudest laughter will ring through the conclaves of infidelity, if Christians should agree in proclaiming, that their religion contains a series of facts, and a scheme of doctrines: that they allow the facts to be false, but that they maintain the doctrines to be true and divinely inspired.

We must, however, stop. We have already devoted to the refutation of Mr. Powell's heterodoxy a much larger number of our pages than his notions intrinsically deserve. But he is one of a school, and he fills—and, on the score of his general attainments, deservedly fills—a professor's chair in the University of Oxford. These collateral circumstances could not but be taken into the account; and thus the short and cursory notice which we intended, when we began to write, has swollen into a review of rather bulky dimensions.

We have shown the theory set forth by Mr. Powell, and the tone in which he speaks of the adverse section of geologists. We cannot but suspect that he is half disposed in his heart to deal with Dr. Buckland and his school in the same terms of contemptuous censure. From the whole tenor of the extracts it appears manifest that Mr. Powell conceives the result of geological researches to be directly at variance with the Mosaic account of the Creation. He offers, it is true, a consolation, which is but cold comfort to our mind:—namely, that the discrepancy is of no consequence in the world, although it happens to put the Scriptures intirely in the wrong. But what counter theory, it may be asked, have we to propose instead of this system of the Savilian professor? We have *none whatever*. We do not think that the time is yet arrived for making systems in geology. The habit of making them, on either side, is the very thing which we deprecate; and we are thankful to Providence that the Bible is no more responsible for the mistakes of its injudicious friends, than its veracity must stand or fall at the bidding of philosophers, or according to the dictates of any system-monger under the sun. We have even doubts whether implicit faith ought to be placed upon any geological conclusion, drawn merely from an examination of present appearances, or the history of the past; for when men reason *backwards*, a hundred plausibilities may be often found to make their peculiar hypothesis square with existing or recorded phenomena; and therefore, nothing, we think, will be satisfactorily beyond the reach of cavil, until geologists shall announce beforehand what changes will take place upon the globe, and the changes shall take place in strict accordance with

their announcement, just as we irresistibly attach credence to the reality of astronomical knowledge, from the calculation of eclipses, or as the identity of Biela's comet is proved by its recurrence at the time predicted. In the meantime, we shall be content to believe, that, as the mighty volume of nature is unrolled and unfolded more and more, so it will develop more and more the divinity of our religion, and the inspiration of our sacred writings. Our present business, moreover, has been to institute an examination of Mr. Powell's opinions, not as they may or may not be unscientific, but as they may or may not be heterodox.\*

In conclusion, indeed, we would just say three words of mere personal explanation. Mr. Powell has fallen into two mistakes, upon which he must allow us to set him right. The one is, that he misapprehends the nature of the charge which may be brought against him. We do not complain that the Mosaic record should be submitted to the test of actual phenomena, but that Mr. Powell prejudices the question, and dogmatizes upon its results. We do not complain of him for what he may effect in the field of geology, but for what he asserts in that province of inquiry which cannot be extended beyond the limits of the Bible. We do not complain of him for pursuing his investigations in the physical science, but for stating absurd propositions in the science of divinity. We do not object to his cosmological researches, but we enter our decided protest against his theological crudities. For, cavil as he may, the question in which he is concerned is a *theological* and not a *geological* question. It turns upon the contents of the Word of God, and the Word of God is to be explained by itself, and not tortured or falsified to suit extraneous speculations.

After this statement, the other error of Mr. Powell will fall to pieces of itself. He is fond of drawing a parallel, either express or implied, between the case of the Florentine philosopher, as he was persecuted by the Roman ecclesiastics in the sixteenth century, and the self-styled philosophers, who are supposed to be persecuted in the nineteenth, through the bigoted ignorance of the orthodox clergy. With all deference, be it said, that nothing in this world can be more absurd. The comparison is really not so much to the purpose as honest Fluellen's between Macedon and Monmouth, or Harry and Alexander the Great. We accuse not the British Association of any conspiracy against the religion of Christendom; or, if we suspected them of so insane a design, we should look with

\* We are, therefore, careful to separate our remarks in this Article upon Mr. Powell from our observations in another upon the geological labours of Mr. Lyell. The two questions are entirely distinct. The observations upon Mr. Lyell's geology may be erroneous, and yet the strictures upon Mr. Powell's divinity may be correct, or "*vice versa*." All we mean to say is, that both matters stand on their own ground, and have no necessary connexion.



a smile of pity upon its hopelessness of success. The members may meet when and where they will: they may make experiments, or they may make speeches: they may read philosophical papers before dinner, or bandy compliments over their wine: they may scale the heights of science, or content themselves with the inferior glory of inventing another Phenakistiscope; but we shall believe the ultimate interests of the gospel to be equally safe. For the rest, Mr. Powell may be assured he is in no peril. The cry of "science persecuted," is at least as preposterous as the cry of "Religion in danger!" We see no signs of a persecuting temper in the church: no disposition to convert philosophers into martyrs: and even if such a disposition existed, we hardly think that Mr. Baden Powell is the first victim whom ecclesiastical indignation or terror would select. If he is *roasted* at all, he will only have to endure the very metaphorical roasting of paper in some literary publication. As far as we divine, the majority of Churchmen are not inclined to be protestant inquisitors, more than Mr. Powell happens to be another Galileo.

We could have wished to have given a detailed account of his last publication, and to have shown by the citation of particular passages, the talent and information which it displays. The book is well worthy of criticism, and Mr. Powell may be assured, that, except in a case where an imperative sense of duty interferes, we have any thing rather than a desire to speak harshly of himself or his productions. But our space is confined; and, moreover, our object has not been to discuss questions of physical science; and simply to exhibit the tendency of certain speculations, bearing partly indeed upon science, but much more upon religion. Mr. Powell, too, is quite as sensible as we can be, that his book, notwithstanding the many evidences of ability and acquirements which it unquestionably contains, and the occasional vigour of the style, is not exactly what it ought to be. One fault of it is—as the matter appears to us—that it is not in reality a condensed, and comprehensive, and systematic history of natural philosophy, but is too much broken up into personal biographies or notices of scientific *men*. However, its chief and manifest defect, as Mr. Powell very candidly allows, is that it is out of all drawing, that there is no harmony in its parts, and that some of its members are considerably too big for the rest. The fore-quarters and the hind-quarters do not match. It is in fact a mis-shapen thing, and like King Richard,

"I, that am curtail'd of this fair proportion,  
Cheated of feature by dissembling nature,  
Deform'd, unfinish'd, sent before my time  
Into this breathing world, scarce half made up."

Only for "dissembling nature," read "Dr. Lardner." Mr. Powell, we think, would have done far better, if he had written on his own account; it is his misfortune that he has been compelled to cut and squeeze his ideas into the Procrustean bed of one of the volumes in the Cabinet Cyclopædia.

- 
- ART. IX.—1. *Rapport sur l'Etat de l'Instruction Publique dans quelque Pays de l'Allemagne, et particulièrement en Prusse.* Par M. V. Cousin, Conseiller d'Etat, Professeur de Philosophie, Membre de l'Institut et du Conseil Royal de l'Instruction Publique. Paris, 1833.
2. *Etat de l'Instruction Primaire.* Par M. V. Cousin, Supplément a Rapport sur l'Instruction Publique, en Prusse. Paris, 1833.
3. *England and the English.* By E. L. Bulwer, Esq., M. P. London: Richard Bentley.
4. *Annual Report of the National Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Established Church, throughout England and Wales, for 1832 and 1833.* London: J. G. and F. Rivington.
5. *Report of the British and Foreign School Society to the General Meeting, May 10, 1830, with an Appendix.* London: Longman & Co.
6. *Annual Report of the Sunday School Union.*
7. *A Sermon.* By the Rev. John James Taylor.
8. *Works for the Promotion of Sunday Schools.* By the Rev. J. C. Wigram, the Rev. J. Medley, and the Rev. J. Hull. London: Parker.
9. *The Teacher: or Moral Influences employed in the Instruction of the Young. Intended chiefly to assist Young Teachers in organizing and conducting their Schools.* By Jacob Abbott, Principal of Mount Vernon School. Revised by the Rev. Charles Mayo, LL. D. Late Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford. London: Seeleys. 1834.

WE are not offering National Education as a new subject to our readers, and indeed the vastness of its importance may well compensate for the want of novelty: but we offer it as a subject which presents itself in a new shape. The question is no longer *whether* the people shall be educated, but *how* the people shall be educated: what instrumentality shall be used; and what quantity, and kind, of information shall be provided. The former question, we may thank Providence, is set at rest; and assuredly

we have no disposition to disturb it from its repose. The enemies of National Education, wherever they exist, may entertain their sentiments in secret, or mutter them to a few congenial spirits with whom "the winter of discontent" will never soften into spring; but refuted and exploded objections they will not openly avow, in the conviction that their murmurs would be immediately drowned in the loud voice of universal acclamation. On this topic, then, we shall not add a word; merely desiring it to be borne in mind throughout the whole of our remarks, that we consider a sound education of the country going hand in hand with the religion of the country, to be the great lever of human amelioration, the one main thing, without which all other improvements will be uncertain and almost worthless. If we know any stronger and more emphatic terms to express our sense of the value and necessity of national education, those terms we should use.

The other branch of the inquiry—which regards the *mode* and *extent* of National Education—we approach with the honest anxiety of men who feel that they are approaching a subject which virtually affects the temporal welfare of the community and the spiritual interests of its individual members. We would consider it, we would treat it as something too high and sacred to be made a party question; something which belongs to a pure and elevated region, far above the storms and vapours of political or polemical bitterness. We would treat it as a matter as yet unsettled; a matter on which wise and good men have differed, and may differ with the most entire singleness of purpose, and the most conscientious desire of eliciting and promulgating truth. But not the less we shall express the conclusions, at which we have arrived, with an unflinching and uncompromising determination; and do our best to expose a variety of errors, which must be perilous in a direct proportion to the momentous nature of the investigation.

For the new shape, in which the question of popular education, like almost every other, presents itself, many obvious reasons may be assigned. For various concurrent circumstances have taken place within a very few years, of which it is the inevitable tendency and effect, that all matters of public interest must now be subjected to a wider and more searching scrutiny than heretofore, and undergo a thorough examination, not so much of their details as of their principles. The very progress of society itself, speeding on as it does with a rapid and ever increasing velocity, is one palpable and mighty cause.

We would begin by stating very frankly in what points we agree with the advocates of State Education, and in what points

we differ from them. We believe, then, quite as cordially and earnestly, as they can believe, that the elements of a good, sound, comprehensive education, ought to be placed within the reach of every poor child in the empire, male or female: and that their parents, or other natural protectors, ought to be induced, by all legitimate means, to secure for their children the vast advantages of such an education, thus placed within their reach. We also think that the provision, however wide, should, as much as possible, be a sure and permanent provision; subject as little as possible to fluctuations and mischances. So far our hearty concurrence goes along with their speculations. But they proceed to affirm that such an education, as has been proposed, cannot be afforded permanently and certainly without the intervention of the state, and *can* be afforded with the intervention of the state. To both these propositions the affirmative as well as the negative, and the negative as well as the affirmative, we beg leave to demur. We affirm, on the contrary, that under the circumstances of this country, the interference of the state will derange the efforts of individuals, and yet cannot do so much as individuals may effect, and are effecting. Upon these points we join issue: and although no certainty can be attained, because future contingencies are involved, we trust to be able to show that the probabilities are decidedly in our favour.

With the disadvantages under which we labour in espousing this side of the question, we are not unacquainted; nor with the imputations of bigotry and narrow-mindedness to which we shall be infallibly exposed. But these things will not disturb our repose; and our opinion, long entertained, and at least carefully considered, has now hardened into a rock, which, we really apprehend, our opponents can neither blow up with the gunpowder of their invectives, nor melt with the vinegar of their spleen. At the same time, the principle of education by the state is, we know, the fashionable principle. It carries about with it the appearance of a fine, liberal, philosophical, cosmopolitan spirit. Its advocacy seems an indication that a man has travelled, that he has enlarged and emancipated his mind by a contemplation of foreign countries and foreign systems, and not remained shut up in his insular prejudices, like a snail in its shell.

This line too is taken by the larger and more noisy portion of the public and periodical press. A society, established under the most powerful patronage, adopts it in all its publications; and when a man returns from the continent, his "tour" or "journal" is hardly complete without an eulogium upon Prussian education. Hence not merely Dissenters and Infidels and *Doctrinaires*, who have their own objects to promote, demand a state education for

the people ; but the busy parrots of society think it indispensable to speak in the same key.

But it may be said, why should these circumstances be mentioned, since they cannot affect the merits of the case? No ; they cannot affect the merits of a case, but they can very much affect its results. We state these circumstances, because we know their potency. We know how seductive they are to the *youth* of a country ; and with how magnetic an influence they draw over that large class of persons, who never by any accident form an individual and unborrowed opinion. We could point to recent questions of the highest import, which have been determined in a similar way, by considerations quite foreign to their real merits ; simply because an unthinking outcry, swollen by many who were profoundly indifferent to the matter at issue, has been at length treated as the universal wish and sentiment of the nation. We therefore call upon that part of the community which is unwilling that the education of the empire should be re-cast in a new mould, not to be inert and passive, not to suffer their enemies, as they have too often suffered them, to have all the *talk* and all the *press* to themselves ; and we entreat of every reflecting and inquiring and Christian patriot, to weigh both sides well, before his personal verdict is irrevocably delivered.

Upon this, as upon every other question, our wish is to take the plainest, the most open, and the most straight-forward course which can possibly be adopted. We are equally anxious not to disguise our own sentiments, and not to misrepresent the sentiments of our opponents. We wish our statements to be narrowly and critically examined ; because we profess that, after a long and diligent search, they are written with a decided bias to a particular line of conduct ; but we trust that we may be found staunch advocates of one side, without being unjust to the other. We declare at the outset that we have arrived at a conviction, not merely that the plans of state education hitherto proposed will not be found expedient or practicable in this country ; but that *no* plan of state education can be now adapted to it without more danger than the experiment is worth. And we hope to bring others over to this conclusion :—1st. By some preliminary and general considerations ; 2ndly. By an examination of the evidence brought forward by the advocates of education by the state ; 3rdly. By the adduction of counter-evidence on our own side of the question.

The whole question as to the legitimate province of the *state*, the real extent of its jurisdiction, and the proper sphere of its intervention, is still exhibited in a state singularly cloudy and confused. Some would have a legislative provision of religion for the country, but not a legislative provision for the subsistence of

its poor; others, on the contrary, would support Poor Laws and put down Church Establishments: some think the religion of a land and not its education ought to be left to individual energies; some, again, its education and not its religion. Surely it is safest to conclude, amidst all these conflicting opinions, that the several problems cannot be solved generally *per se*, but must be taken in relation to the moral and physical attitude of each separate people, and considered as particular and variable applications of some wider and more comprehensive principles in social science. At least, if Mr. Macaulay could inform his constituents at Leeds, that "the question of a Church Establishment was not one which admitted of a general solution," we may say, in return, that no general solution can be given to the problem of education by the state. What are the wants, what the habits, what the social and intellectual condition of the country; how the intended recipients of the state-education are likely to think and act; how the proposed scheme will affect existing interests and existing institutions; whether it is likely to be better or worse than some system in actual operation, which it must interrupt or displace; whether, in fact, the soil requires and will bear the species of culture which is recommended, or will produce a superior harvest if the former tillage is continued; all these are preliminary or concomitant questions, which cannot be safely disregarded.

While, therefore, we find it true, on the broadest scale, that one great source of human error and human ignorance is that human labour and ingenuity are worse than wasted upon indeterminate problems, and that many questions cannot be satisfactorily answered, because they are improperly proposed, these observations have a more especial truth with reference to the great subject immediately before us. The expediency or in expediency of state education can not be ascertained, if the inquiry be framed in an universal shape. To ask whether education by the state is good or bad, is almost as absurd as to ask whether phlebotomy is good or bad; or whether it be a good thing or a bad thing to grow corn or to grow timber; without paying any definite consideration to the constitution, or localities, or temporary circumstances of the particular case.

We shall not then be betrayed into the puerile pedantry of examining in the abstract whether legislative interference is preferable, in the matter of popular education, to the exertions of societies and individuals; but whether such a plan of state education as is now likely to be introduced into this country, will, in the present aspect and position of the country, be a blessing or a bane, an improvement or an injury. It becomes, therefore, absolutely indispensable to inquire under what forms, and by what



persons, and with what views, the project is now urged forward, and also to trace, in a few lines, the past history of the question; that we may estimate its *comparative* as well as *positive* appearance, and mark the differences of tone and feeling which have been gradually assumed.

The whole history of the subject is most interesting; but we can do no more at present than trace it back in our own country from the beginning of the present century. In 1802, 1803, the system of mutual instruction having been lately introduced, a controversy was raging between the respective merits of Bell and Lancaster. As yet, however, the question of a state education does not appear to have been seriously raised. In 1805 Dr. Bell proposed the scheme of a school on the Madras model, and suggested "the expediency of forming a Board of Education." The suggestion, however, met at that time with no particular encouragement, nor do any steps appear to have been taken. The watch-word of the opposite party then was—"If the thing is done at all—if the education of the poor goes on—we are content." (*Ed. Rev.* Oct. 1811.) Moreover, there were established the two rival societies—"the National Society for the Education of the Poor, and the British and Foreign School Society"—associations naturally arising out of the agitation of the subject, the ferment of men's minds, and the general progress of intelligence and philanthropy in the empire. In the years 1816, 1818, was sitting the celebrated Committee on the State of Education among the Lower Orders, which was originally appointed through the efforts of the present Lord Chancellor, then Mr. Henry Brougham. In the process of that Committee's inquiries, we find, by looking through the evidence, that the utility of legislative interference in the business of popular instruction, was a point occasionally considered; and some strong declarations in its favour were elicited from the Rev. Daniel Wilson, now Bishop of Calcutta, and some other witnesses. But the whole character of that testimony assures us, that the interference then contemplated was a state education as the friend, and not the supplanter of the state religion; was a plan which would put the state school by the side of the state church, and on the footing of the same principles: not one which should lead forward the new scheme as the invader and the usurper of the power and the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical establishment. We insert the reverend gentleman's own words, from p. 294 of the Minutes of Evidence.

"I think it of high importance to inspire the great mass of your population, already members of the Church of England, with a fixed and enlightened regard to their own religious establishment; and I consider further, the particular principles of religion upon which our church is

founded, to be so essential to that religion, that I regard the National system, when it can be obtained, as having incomparably the advantage over the British and Foreign system."

Again, when proposals were hinted for merging the two societies in some middle and central system, under the superintendence of the legislature, we find it well objected in a pamphlet of the day—

"Both these societies are accomplishing their purposes quite as rapidly as their best friends can desire. As rivals and competitors, I am persuaded they are mutually serviceable to each other; they are at once checks against abuse, and springs for mutual activity; but if they could be amalgamated, they would both perish, and then a sickly hermaphrodite would be formed, which would prove sterile and barren for all purposes of public utility."\*

The following remarks also, from the Third Report of the Committee, are deserving of close attention, and in their contrast to the temper since exhibited, and the strictures since hazarded, may excite at once a sigh and a smile. The latter part of the extract, which may seem at the first glance to militate against the general drift of our argument, shews the *felt* perplexities which embarrass the subject.

"Since the inquiries of your Committee have been extended to the whole island, they have had reason to conclude that the means of educating the poor *are steadily increasing* in all considerable towns, as well as in the metropolis. A circular letter has been addressed to all the clergy in England, Scotland and Wales, requiring answers to queries, of which a copy will be found in the appendix. *It is impossible to bestow too much commendation upon the alacrity shown by those reverend persons in complying with this requisition; and the honest zeal which they displayed to promote the great object of UNIVERSAL EDUCATION is truly worthy of the pastors of the people, and the teachers of that gospel which was preached to the poor.*

"*Wherever the efforts of individuals can support the requisite number of schools, it would be unnecessary and injurious to interpose any parliamentary interference.*

"In the numerous districts where no aid from private exertions can be expected, and where the poor are manifestly without adequate means of instruction, your Committee are persuaded that nothing can supply the deficiency but the adoption, under certain material modifications, of the Parish School system, so usefully established in the northern part of the island ever since the latter part of the seventeenth century, and upon which many important details will be found in the appendix.

"Your Committee forbear to inquire minutely in *what manner this system ought to be connected with the Church Establishment. That such a connection ought to be formed appears manifest; it is dictated by a re-*

\* Plain Thoughts on Mr. Brougham's Education Bill. By a Plain Englishman, 1821.

*gard to the prosperity and stability of both systems ; and in Scotland the two are mutually connected together,* But a difficulty arises in England which is not to be found there. The great body of the dissenters from the Scottish Church differ little, if at all, in doctrine from the Establishment ; they are separated only by certain opinions of a political rather than a religious nature, respecting the right of patronage, and by some shades of distinction as to church discipline ; so that they may conscientiously send their children to parish schools connected with the Establishment, and teaching its catechism. In England the case is widely different, and it appears to your Committee essentially necessary that this circumstance be carefully considered in the devising arrangements of the system. To place the choice of the schoolmaster in the parish vestry, subject to the approbation of the parson and the visitation of the diocesan ; but to provide that the children of sectarians shall not be compelled to learn any catechism, or attend any church, other than those of their parents, seems to your Committee the safest path by which the legislature can hope to obtain the desirable objects of security to the Establishment on the one hand, and justice to the Dissenters on the other."

The most remarkable thing, however, connected with the proceedings of this Committee was, " the lame and impotent conclusion" of the whole inquiry. Mr. Brougham proposed a comprehensive plan of National Education ; and "*Mr. Brougham's Education Bill was lost, because the Dissenters considered it too favourable to the Established Church.*" Such a blow coming from such a quarter was decisive, for matters were not yet ripe for the introduction, or even the deliberate mention, of a state education on the principles of dissent. And nearly in this state did things remain until the passing of the Reform Bill. Then, however, a fresh page was opened, and a change came over the spirit of the people. The dawn of a new day—whether it is about to be bright or stormy—opened upon the question, which had slept for some years in abeyance, because the high church party deemed it more advisable to continue their private efforts than to push a plan of state education in conformity with the principles of the Establishment ; and the seceders felt how hopeless was the attempt to push it upon the principles which now seem mounting into the ascendant. Another tone was taken, and one influential organ of the liberal party has thus delivered its oracles.

" After, and as a consequence, of Reform, the education of the people, as an affair of public concern, is, we think, determined. As the state can now only be administered for the benefit of all, education, as the essential condition of the social and individual well-being of the people, cannot fail of commanding the immediate attention of the legislature." Before, of course, " what could be expected of a parliament, which, as it did not represent the general interests, was naturally hostile to the general intelligence of the people ? What could be expected from

a church which dreaded, in the diffusion of knowledge, a reform of its own profitable abuses"!—*Ed. Rev.* No. 116.

Again—

"The principal master should profess the faith of the majority; the subordinate master that of the minority."

A note is then subjoined.

"This liberality is general throughout Germany, and if we are ever to enjoy the blessings of a national education in the united kingdom, the same principle must be universally applied. An established church becomes a nuisance when (AS HITHERTO IN ENGLAND AND IRELAND) it interposes an obstacle to the universal diffusion of religion and intelligence."

*Argul*, as the grave-digger says, "the Established Church in England and Ireland has hitherto been a nuisance."

Another publication, advocating the same views, declares—

"A central board, free from all religious bias, ought, in our opinion, to be the *fulcrum* on which the entire system of education should ultimately rest."—*For. Quart. Rev.* vol. xii. p. 295.

In a similar strain "The Penny Magazine," "The Companion to the Newspaper," "The Quarterly Journal of Education," and other works under the same influence, open their artillery together, with, as it should appear, the spleen-exciting exception of the "Companion to the Almanac." Nor can the spirit in which the question has been, and is likely to be, discussed in the House of Commons be misunderstood, more than the general tenets of the speakers and writers who are most active in the business. Messrs. Roebuck, Grote, Bowring, and the whole tribe of Benthamites, are the chief personages who stand out in the eye of the country as the champions and heralds of education by the state. With what attendant hopes, and for what collateral purposes, they press it, we have little need to say, for *they* take very little pains to disguise; and we know that they would rather be inclined to resent as an insult, than accept as a compliment, any supposition on our part that they would be favourable to so effete, so barbarous, and so unphilosophical a system, as "*Church of Englandism*."

Thus the features of the case are entirely altered. We neither affirm nor enquire whether they are altered for the better or for the worse, for our statement hitherto is historical and not critical: we merely deduce, as a corollary from the foregoing sketch, this alternative proposition: that either State Education cannot now be introduced at all into this country; or, if it be introduced, can only be introduced upon the principle, that all sects and denominations shall be placed upon the same footing; that only the generalities of Religion shall be admitted into the course of

instruction; and that no peculiar doctrines or articles shall be taught, belonging to a dominant or Established Church. The man, who can imagine for an instant, that the Dissenters would now be contented with the terms which could not satisfy them before; that the treaty, which was broken off in 1819, could now be resumed on conditions which would secure a paramount ascendancy to the Ecclesiastical Institutions which are connected with the state; and that the pretensions and demands of the non-conformists will not rise with the excitement of their expectations, must be utterly blind and deaf to the sights and sounds around him, and altogether impenetrable to any arguments which we could use. The hide of a rhinoceros, or the seven-fold shield of Ajax, son of Telamon, must be as muslin to the case of obstinacy or ignorance in which his mind is sheathed.

This slight retrospect, then, must be sufficient to shew in how serious, and we cannot but add, in how portentous a shape the scheme of State Education is now forced before us; and under auspices, how alarming to the friends of existing establishments, it is sure to be introduced. State education appears as the adopted and favourite child of that same movement party, the members of which are wedded and pledged to the prosecution of sundry other schemes, which, if carried into effect, would not leave one stone upon another in the time-honoured and time-hallowed edifice of our English institutions. Nay, we deliberately assert, that the project of Education by the State is necessarily mixed up with those other schemes, and that it forms an integral and essential part of one general design for bringing on a kind of philosophical revolution, based, as its abettors maintain, on sound abstract principles of political science. How really narrow, and shallow, and short-sighted are the views of this party, in spite of the proud claim which they prefer to depth and comprehensiveness, we may attempt to prove on some future occasion: here it is enough to hint that the question of State Education, as it now *practically* presents itself in England, cannot be taken into grave and statesmanlike consideration, even scarcely ever be understood, without looking to them for a moment with a brief and rapid, but steady and earnest glance. Nor is it too much to affirm that when they are steadily considered, the excellent and enlightened men, who, only two or three years ago, might have felt a general bias towards the intervention of the state in the details of popular instruction, may now, without the slightest inconsistency, deprecate *such* an intervention as it must inevitably be.

Another object which we have sought to accomplish by this retrospective sketch, is to simplify the subject, and clear away some of the difficulties by which it is environed. At first, every

thing about it seems a mere bundle of the strangest anomalies.— They who are loudest in favour of the voluntary principle in Religion most violently deny the voluntary principle in education; and they who oppose the State Education, are sedulous to maintain a State Church. But the contradiction vanishes as we look closer. The State Church would keep a particular liturgy and articles; the State Education would esteem all sects alike. It is at least nothing contradictory or incongruous to resist an educational system which would proceed on one principle, as an addition to a Church system which proceeds on another. It is the attempted union which is manifestly incongruous and utterly contradictory to itself. Let our policy at least be one: “*Sibi constet*” is as good a rule in politics, as in literature or morals.

Nor, again, is it inconsistency to say that a national religion, of which the great object is to infuse the spirit of Christianity into every heart and mind of the country, would supersede the necessity of education by the state; because individuals who are once really inoculated with the principles of the Gospel, would never require to be taxed in order to afford to the poor, and ignorant, and helpless of their fellow-creatures the knowledge, whether religious or secular, whether divine or human, which is proper for their condition. But if an Established Church is thus sufficient in itself without an educational establishment to assist it, what shall we say if the educational establishment is to be set up in direct rivalry and opposition to the Established Church?

This, however, is in some measure an anticipation, and therefore warns us that it is high time to proceed from these introductory remarks, to the evidence which may be now adduced before the tribunal of public opinion, either for or against education by the state.

1. The first great argument is drawn from authority, or precedent, or the example of other nations. Our answer to it will be by showing that there is absolutely *no* authority, *no* precedent, *no* example, which bears properly upon England. But we begin by saying, more generally, that if there be any lesson taught us by the history or experience of mankind, that experience teaches us the danger of *transplanting* institutions, without previously inquiring, whether they are fit for the new soil, and the new soil is fit for them; in other words, whether they will *grow*. They, at least, who are acquainted with the constitutions dispersed abroad over both hemispheres by Mr. Bentham, or sent from Great Britain by more practical politicians, must have a painful knowledge, that it would have been better to give them to the wings of the wind, than to the wilder elements of civil dissension; better to have made them auxiliary to the cook-maid in lighting the kitchen



fire, than instrumental in kindling, through whole provinces, the combustion of anarchy and revolt. Or, to take the more particular case of education, the fortunes of Joseph Lancaster in South America might inform us, that it is not enough to decree education by the state, without having the right materials *with* which and *upon* which the scheme is to be worked; and that the calm but mighty toils of popular instruction are not likely to be successfully pursued amidst the crush of constitutional changes and the ferment of political disputes.

An appeal, however, has been made even to antiquity. Crete and Persia and Sparta have been summoned as witnesses. With the fables about Crete, and Xenophon's ingenious romance about Persia, our readers would hardly thank us for fatiguing their attention. In Sparta, it is true, the rich might be educated by the state; but the poor, that is, the helots, were not merely neglected, but condemned to brutish ignorance by a designed and elaborate degradation. When we consider these circumstances then, and also take into account the size and population of Sparta, if we wanted a parallel instance in our time and country, we should conceive it might be something like the following. The parish of Mary-le-bone ought to turn the majority of its inhabitants, all the lower and poorer inhabitants, into domestic slaves. The rest, *adults* as well as children, ought to be subjected to the constant and inquisitorial controul of a local government. Neither their souls, nor minds, nor bodies, ought to be their own. The young people, instead of being sent to Eton or a private tutor, ought to be trained and exercised together in a large hall or lyceum. As to the style of clothing, there is discretion in silence. As to the diet, they ought all to dine in public upon black broth, which would now be refused in the workhouse. This, we imagine, to be not a *beau ideal*, but a fair and faithful portrait of ancient education by the state.

To speak seriously, both the theory and practice of antiquity proceeded upon much more extensive notions of the prerogative and jurisdiction of the government or state, than the moderns have usually retained. The continental states, however, have made a nearer approach to them than our insular prepossessions will admit. Here it happens that, if we could fully prosecute the present inquiry, we ought to examine, up to what period of life and what point of the social scale the educational discipline of the state ought to be administered. Of old it included all classes; and, perhaps, upon all principles of general reasoning it ought to include all classes; whereas in England the *practical* question is, and must remain, not whether the state is to educate the *whole* rising generation, but whether it is to educate the children of the

poor; so utterly inapplicable to our particular position are all abstract speculations. But to this point we shall be brought hereafter by the due course of our argument; let us here only observe, with reference to the spirit of ancient, and in some places of modern legislation, that if such maxims are tenable, and if they prove any thing, they prove immeasurably too much; they prove that a state may interfere with all parents and all children, and communicate what quantity and quality of education it may please. But this appears to us almost the most dangerous and most despotic of political-theories. It is a principle neither pliant nor progressive; a principle fatal to freedom, fatal to the advance of knowledge, and to elasticity or buoyancy or vigour of opinion.

We proceed in our survey to periods less remote from our own. The more recent models proposed to us for our guidance are, the United States of America, Scotland, Ireland under its new educational régime, France, Prussia and the other parts of Germany.

With regard to America, it is not a case in point, even as to the nature of the instruction which is afforded. It is still less a case in point as to any general resemblance in the condition of the two countries. It would be idle, we had almost said insane, to reason from a new and thinly inhabited country, in which few positive institutions have had time to take root, to an old country with a crowded population and a multiplicity of inveterate feelings and usages engrained into its character; from a Republic which has no Ecclesiastical Establishment, to a limited Monarchy which has the Church connected with the State.

As to Scotland, again, the parallel will not hold for a moment. The wide distinction between the two parts of the island has been manifested by the extracts which we have already quoted. Again, "in Scotland," it has been said—we shall not stop to inquire by whom—"our Presbyterian Clergy have a sort of legal right to interfere with all teachers of youth." And yet further,—

"Any man but moderately acquainted with 'our island,' must know, that in Scotland there is an established national system of education, supported by the same funds which maintain the Church, and arranged on a similar plan. A preacher, who undertakes to lecture on this subject from the chair of St. Paul's, might really have been presumed to know that every parish in Scotland has a school as well as a kirk—that the supplies for its support are payable, *by law*, from the lands in the parish, as certainly as the stipend of the clergyman, and that the ecclesiastical courts hold themselves entitled to superintend the conduct of the schoolmasters, both public and private, exactly as they exercise their rigorous discipline over the lives of persons having the cure of souls. It is true, that there exist great doubts upon the matter of right, respecting this superintendence. It is equally true that, the Scottish church having no liturgy—no form either of prayer or of worship—no peculiarity, in

short, except an absence of all peculiar ceremonials—he who speaks in big terms of the conformity required of teachers, and the advantages resulting to the national religion in Scotland, from the adoption of its tenets by the parochial schools, uses a language whereof he knows not the import, and mouths large and sounding sentences, which in truth mean nothing.”

These paragraphs, taken together with the extracts before quoted, quite decide the question as to *Scotland*.

But we have heard it stated as to *Ireland*, that the new system is working admirably well: we are told that by returns laid recently upon the table of the House of Commons, it will be found that the Protestant rector, and the Catholic priest, and the Presbyterian minister, all co-operate, zealously and cordially, in affording a common instruction to the people: that Mr. Stanley exults, and Archbishop Whately is in raptures. We have our doubts; but let the fact be assumed. We have never mixed ourselves up with the party, either lay or clerical, which would push matters in Ireland to the opposite extreme; but about that part of the empire we have hardly spirits to speak. Ireland has been one vast anomaly from the days of St. Patrick; and when we hear the sort of state education which is being *tried* in Ireland, mentioned as a precedent for this country, we cannot but put the questions—1st. Was there the same quantity, or any approximation to the same quantity, of existing machinery to be *displaced*? 2ndly. Had the Established Church the same grasp as in England upon the people at large? 3dly. Was there the same proportion of resident gentry to carry forward, by subscriptions, or by personal efforts, the voluntary system of societies and individuals? And, 4thly. Is the general state of the country satisfactory at *this* moment, or becoming more satisfactory month after month? Is the island more tranquil? Are the existing institutions more *secure*? Alas! we hear of ameliorations and amendments, but, in the midst of them, we apprehend, church and state are tottering together; and it may happen at last, that the unhappy land will be ruined in its career of improvements, like King Pyrrhus in the course of his victories.

But yet again, it is urged that the legislature *has* very wisely interfered with education in the West Indies, and that it *has* introduced even compulsory instruction among the children in the factories at home. Now, upon the former point, we will not be tempted to say one word more, than that no common arguments are adducible with reference to the population of England, and the half-emancipated slaves in her distant colonies. Upon the latter we would simply remark, that when a legislative interposition, whether right or wrong, occurs in the case of a certain set of

children, who are collected upon one spot, who are affected by very peculiar circumstances, and any interference in whose behalf happens from local causes to command the sympathies of the people, it by no means follows that a principle is made out capable of universal adaptation to the entire country.

But let us look again beyond our own shores, and, in a more especial manner, to France and Germany. Here it is that we shall chiefly expose ourselves to the charge of a narrow, and illiberal, and unphilosophical bigotry, in opposing a scheme which has the attraction of novelty, and the charm of apparent grandeur and comprehensiveness of design. Here it is that we must go against the stream of popularity, and in the very teeth, perhaps, of some general truths, and many specious common-places. It will be said that we confine ourselves to the small circle of insular prejudices, and deliberately and wantonly exclude ourselves from the benefit of the great workings of the European mind; that we are unwilling, either from a blind obstinacy, or an unfortunate feebleness of vision, to see the majestic progress of universal thought; or import and adopt the improvements of our continental neighbours, and assist the glorious commerce of knowledge and intellectual discovery. Few things would more afflict us than these charges, if they were true; for we hope that we possess some little share, according to our ability, of this catholic and generous spirit; but still we cannot shut our eyes to the delicacy and the danger of applying foreign customs, or general principles, to the peculiar nature of our English circumstances. When the wish is expressed, "*that the admirable scheme of German education may be still further improved and consolidated,*" we can echo it with all sincerity. We allow that to furnish a sound and solid instruction to the whole population is an achievement eminently honourable to any state. We allow that the goal which Prussia is said to have reached is a most desirable goal; but we do not think that we could arrive at it by the same road: we believe, at least, that we shall arrive at it, if not sooner, more certainly by taking another.

Every country has an individual identity of its own. It is a whole of itself, and the several parts of its polity must be of a piece with that whole, and harmoniously blended, each with each and all with all. Every country has its own principle of excellence, its own style of political architecture. To confuse all orders, Gothic and Grecian, Saxon and Composite, is too often to produce weakness no less than deformity. Not merely the proportions are disfigured, but the cohesion and solidity are lost. To say, therefore, that because a particular model of education is found useful in Germany, we ought to transfer it into England, is

to say, in effect, that because vines bear an abundant produce in the South of France, we ought to plant them in the West Riding of Yorkshire.

Nor is it easy in any case to tear away one part of a system from the rest, like a passage from its context. The mistake is to suppose that we can detach the Prussian education from Prussian institutions and Prussian habits. The details *must* be adjusted to the general design. We must consider what will suit a mixed constitution in church and state, consisting of personal freedom, blended with an hereditary monarchy and an ecclesiastical establishment; not what will suit a government essentially despotic, or institutions republican in their polity and latitudinarian in their religion.

Let the liberal innovators who so lavishly heap their compliments upon Prussia, recollect that they *are* compliments paid to the principle of despotism—a despotism too which, in its general and commercial policy, awakens the fierce intolerance of their resentment. Let them recollect that it is the executive strength of an arbitrary government, which communicates vigour and efficacy to the Prussian system. Let them recollect, again, that *that* system ranges through every class of society, and from the most elementary branches of knowledge to the highest and most transcendental. Let them bear in mind that not only the primary schools for the humblest and lowest ranks, but *Progymnasia*, and *Gymnasia*, and Universities, are all subjected to the perpetual supervision and interference of the state. Let them reflect that such a superintendence of education is, and must be, allied to a censorship of the press; that a government which takes charge of the whole instruction may take charge of the whole literature of a country; that it may become the general caterer, and almost the sole purveyor, of its intellectual food; and that the same power which can coerce children to school, or inflict fine and imprisonment upon the parents for not sending them, may clog, throughout a land, the free course of thought, and quite destroy all sober manliness of action. It is difficult—we think impossible—to obtain the good without the evil. We must take all the German system, or none. Which shall we choose? In order that our choice may be the right one, we will endeavour, even at the risk of tediousness, to place the true bearings of the subject more distinctly before our readers.

In Prussia, the throne is the sole fountain of light and knowledge, as well as of honour and power: in England, a thousand streams spring up in a thousand places to irrigate and fertilize the land. In Prussia, everything is to flow down from the ruler to the people; and education, like the civil constitution, is to be con-

sidered as the gift of the king. That king, therefore, while with one hand he unlocks the door of instruction for the poor, may turn the key against the rich with the other hand, and shut up an university while he opens a school. Thus the two systems are founded upon bases totally opposed. The Prussian principle is altogether different from any principle for which there is any parallel among ourselves: it is a principle which Mehemet Ali\* might introduce into Egypt with much more ease than the British legislature could introduce it into England; and it is a principle in itself not half so favourable as our own to the ultimate and general diffusion of a real, and masculine, and healthy intelligence.

The Prussian system is good for Prussia; but the better it is for Prussia the worse it might be for England. It is well compacted, well balanced, and well adjusted to the whole theory and practice of the Prussian government. It is perfectly smooth and equable in its movements, on account of the immense weight which there is to preserve its steadiness. It is, in fact, a juvenile conscription; and serves as a *pendant* and companion for the adult conscription to the army: and if no disturbing forces interfere, it is because there is a heavy control of a military despotism to hold them in check.

In England, the only power which could preserve so vast and complicated a machinery in order, is the power of the Church. But this power is to be impaired, if not subverted, by the scheme itself. With us, then, the scheme is as a satellite, which is to move in a different orbit from its primary: or a planet introduced, which is to travel on its own peculiar principles of motion, and so is sure to derange all the other bodies in the system with some violent concussion. With our modern theorists, nothing is in keeping. To-day they would insert into our mixed constitution new parts, which require the strong hand of an absolute monarchy: to-morrow they would introduce other parts, which are consistent only with republicanism. In short, we find no fault with the Prussian system of education as adapted to Prussia. If we approve the political principles on which it is founded, its *working* is almost perfect. But we may still ask, what would become of its mechanism, if the moving power were altogether wanting? And until a satisfactory answer can be given to this question, its inapplicability to a country like England must remain undisproved. With us the mainspring is wanting: the watch either could never be set going; or, when it stopped, could never be wound up. In that very amusing work entitled "Bub-

\* In Egypt too the compulsory part of the system might be adopted with great effect, because the viceroy might at once apply the bastinado, if the parents were refractory, or the children were inclined to play truant.



bles from the *Brunnens of Nassau*," there is a graphic description of the action of the system in that region of Germany. It may instruct as well as divert all who read with reflection.\* "The young dominie commenced by stating that all the children in Nassau are *obliged*, by order of the duke, to go to school from six to fourteen years of age; that the parents of a child who has intentionally missed, are forced to pay two kreuzers the first time, four the second, six the third, and that if they are too poor to pay these fines, they are obliged to work them out in hard labour, or are otherwise punished for their children's neglect;—that the inhabitants of each village pay the schoolmaster among themselves, in proportions varying according to their means, but that *the duke prescribes what the children are to learn*—namely, religion, singing, reading, writing, Scripture history, the German language, natural history, geography, and accounts; and that the mode of imparting this education is grounded upon the system of Pestalozzi."—p. 214.

France also has been proposed as a model for our imitation; and it has been argued, that if France could follow the example of her ancient and most implacable enemy, Prussia, England, *a fortiori*, ought to follow the example of France. But it is to be remembered that in France the scheme of State Education is not altogether a novelty. It was tried in the early stage of the former revolution, and most signally failed.† The law was a dead letter. Its provisions were washed away in the tears of terror and agony, or in the torrents of blood, shed through the prescriptions of civil massacre. At present—and here we have a pregnant proof that the result must entirely vary with the variation of circumstances—at present, the experiment seems to have a better chance of success. The accounts received from the mayors and other municipal authorities have, we believe, been for the most part favourable, as far as the design has been put into operation. But the ultimate issue of the plan is still uncertain: the clergy, as might be expected, do not look upon it with the most kindly eyes: and some *communes* or *arrondissements* have declared their unwillingness to tax themselves for its support. In either case, France can afford no precedent for England; for there is scarcely less difference between the French theatre and the irregular but bolder dramas of Shakspeare, than between the French system of liberty and our own.

\* While we praise this volume, as a very able and pleasing production, we cannot but express a hope that the opinions expressed in it on the topics of education are not all shared or encouraged by the influential Review which first brought it into notice.

† The first revolution, says M. Victor Cousin, was prodigal in promises; but took no care of their fulfilment.

We are inclined, indeed, to pass eulogium rather than censure upon the authorities in France. In sending M. Cuvier to Holland, M. Cousin to Prussia, and other gentlemen to other parts of Germany, as well as, if the report be true, in making inquiries of Dr. Chalmers as to the system of education in Scotland—that system, be it remarked, which is rather a church system than a state system—they have acted the part, we doubt not, of a liberal and enlightened government.

The report of M. Cousin, with its appendix, is in itself a treasure which will repay them. Our humble panegyric we would offer with eagerness, for we have perused his letters with the very highest gratification. We differ, *toto cælo*, with many opinions expressed in his previous publications. But M. Cousin is a man of profound and almost universal attainments. He is a scholar and a philosopher, who scorns to sacrifice metaphysical and moral upon the altar of mechanical science, or join in the vulgar outcry against classical literature. With the greater part of his statements we have now no concern, for our business is only with primary education intended for the poor. Here he seems to advocate the Prussian system upon the right grounds:—first, because it is consistent in itself and excellently adapted to the form of government; and secondly, because it is *enraciné*, as he expresses it, in the manners, and laws, and usages, and ancient attachments of the people. He also recommends its adoption to his native country on account of the *analogies frappantes*, which exist between Prussia and France. But on such grounds he certainly would not recommend it to *us*, because the striking analogies no conjuror could discover. Although, therefore, the assertion may seem strange, we think it demonstrable that while M. Cousin presses the Prussian system of education upon France, he ought himself, by parity of reasoning, to dissuade its introduction into England.\*

Nothing, indeed, can be more cautious and practical than his tone, as may have been perceived even by those extracts, which have appeared in an English dress.

“In fact, gentlemen,” he says, “*experience* is our guide. This alone have we been anxious to follow, and this alone have we constantly pursued. There is not in this law to be found a single hypothesis.” “In fine, gentlemen, we believe ourselves on the *road* to good.”

M. Cousin has his doubts about the notion of compelling parents to send their children to school; and he expressly allows

\* That is, of course, if he is acquainted with the actual state of England.

that any law concerning national education ought, in France, to be *provisional*.

These few citations, purposely taken from other sources besides the original work, may show that the spirit of Victor Cousin is widely different from the headlong and impetuous violence of theorists in our own country, who would begin every thing *de novo*, and treat England as if it were a *tabula rasa*, on which their own wild fancies could be written at pleasure.

Nor can any testimony be well stronger than the following, to prove that state education is fit for Prussia and other parts of Germany, *may* be fit for France, but is totally unfit for a country so diametrically opposed to both of them, in its past history and present circumstances, as England.

“ On ne peut se refuser à y reconnaître une haute sagesse. Point de principes généraux inapplicables ; point d'esprit de système ; nulle vue particulière et exclusive n'y gouverne le législateur : il prend tous les moyens qui peuvent le conduire à son but, lors même que ces moyens sont très-différens les uns des autres. C'est un roi, et un roi absolu, qui a donné cette loi ; c'est un ministre sans responsabilité qui l'a conseillée ou rédigée : et pourtant *nul esprit mal entendu de centralisation ou de bureaucratie ministérielle ne s'y fait sentir* ; presque tout est livré aux autorités communales, départementales et provinciales ; il ne reste au ministre que l'impulsion et la surveillance générale. Le clergé a une grande part dans le gouvernement de l'instruction populaire, et les pères de famille sont aussi consultés dans les villes et dans les villages. En un mot, tous les intérêts qui interviennent naturellement dans la matière, trouvent leur place dans cette organisation, et concourent, chacun à leur manière, à la fin commune, qui est la civilisation du peuple.

“ La loi prussienne de 1819 me paraît donc excellente ; mais il ne faut pas croire que cette loi soit le fruit de la sagesse d'un seul homme. M. d'Altenstein l'a rédigée plutôt qu'il ne l'a faite, et l'on peut dire qu'elle existait déjà, et dans une foule d'ordonnances partielles, et *dans les usages et les mœurs du pays*. Il n'y a peut-être pas un seul article de cette longue loi qui n'ait de nombreux antécédens ; et dans une notice sur l'histoire de l'instruction primaire en Prusse, insérée dans le premier cahier du second volume du Journal de l'instruction primaire, par le conseiller de Beckedorff, je trouve des réglemens de 1728 et de 1736 qui comprennent une foule de dispositions de la loi de 1819. L'obligation pour les parens d'envoyer leurs enfans à l'école est vieille en Prusse. La haute intervention de l'église dans l'instruction du peuple remonte à l'origine du protestantisme, auquel elle est inhérente.”

“ *Enfin, cette loi ne fait guère que régulariser ce qui était déjà, non-seulement en Prusse, mais dans toute l'Allemagne. Ce n'est donc point une utopie métaphysique, arbitraire et artificielle, comme la plupart de nos lois sur l'instruction primaire ; celle-là est fondée sur la réalité et l'expérience. Voilà pourquoi elle a été exécutée et a porté rapidement les fruits les plus heureux.*”—Cousin, *Rapport sur Instruction Publique*, pp. 241, 242.

In fact, when we read M. Cousin's report, we seem transported to a new world; but, as to any similarity, of position we might as well borrow our institutions from the moon.

Of the parties who have introduced this work of M. Cousin to the notice of England, Mr. E. L. Bulwer, we believe, professes to be the first. Of his own production, "*England and the English*"—flashy, flimsy and ambitious, but certainly not devoid of spirit and cleverness,—we have no time to speak. Only, why should Mr. Bulwer disgrace his abilities, and bring a nest of hornets about him, who will sting his repose to death, by his perpetual affectations and egotisms? A few stray papers, which might have been put into "*The New Monthly Magazine*," entitled "*England and the English!*" A man might as well throw together some loose observations "*de omnibus rebus, et quibusdam aliis*," and denominate them "*Earth and its Inhabitants*." And what can be more ludicrous than the lofty tone taken in the following paragraphs?

"I propose then, that *the State* shall establish universal education. I propose that it shall be founded on, and combined with, religious instruction. I propose that to all popular schools for intellectual instruction, labour or industry schools should be appended, or rather, that each school shall unite both objects. I propose, that at the schools for girls, (for in the system I recommend, both sexes *shall be* instructed)," &c. &c. "I propose (and this also is the case in Prussia) that every boy educated at the popular schools shall learn the simpler elements of agricultural and manual science, that he shall acquire the habit, *the love*, and the aptitude of work; that the first lesson in his moral code shall be that which teaches him to prize independence, and that he shall practically obey the rule of his catechism, and learn to get his own living."—*Appendix A.*, pp. 389, 390.

As Mr. Bulwer must be aware,\* *his proposing* that every boy should acquire "*a love of work*," is an amusing joke, and nothing more; but he goes on with sundry other propositions, as if every thing was to originate with himself, and Mr. E. L. Bulwer was instructor-general of the kingdom to his Majesty, or at least president of the projected board. "*I look round; I see the desire for*" so and so; "*shall I have such and such men for me or against me?*"

However, he manages, with the most innocent unconsciousness, to furnish a very strong argument *against* state education, and we thank him. Although their insertion here may somewhat disturb

\* Of his unhappy blundering, where he says, that "*the Charter-house, Winchester, King's College, were all intended, pro pauperes et indigentes scholares, for poor and indigent scholars*," vol. i. p. 300, we shall not take advantage. The fallacy into which he is betrayed, saying nothing of the wording of it, has been long ago exposed and exploded.

the current of our remarks, we put the following observations at once upon record; the good and the bad, the false and the true, the sensible and the ridiculous, together.

“And here, Sir, let us do justice to the clergy of our established church. No men have been more honourably zealous in their endeavours to educate the poor.”—p. 302, 303.

“I take pleasure in rendering due homage to the zeal of our country’s clergy. One-third part of all the children educated in England are educated under their care; and in vindicating them, let us vindicate, from a vulgar and ignorant aspersion, a great truth: the Christian clergy throughout the world have been the great advancers and apostles of education. And even in the darker ages, when priestcraft was to be overthrown, it received its first assaults from the courageous enlightenment of priests.

“A far greater proportion of the English population are now sent to school than is usually supposed, and currently stated. I see before me at this moment, a statistical work, which declares the proportion to be only one in seventeen for England, one in twenty for Wales. What is the fact? Why, that our population for England and Wales amounts nearly to fourteen millions, and that the number of children receiving elementary education in 1828 are, by the returns, 1,500,000; an additional 500,000 being supposed, not without reason, to be educated at independent schools, not calculated in the return. Thus, out of a population of fourteen millions, we have no less than two millions of children receiving elementary education at schools.”—p. 304, 305.

“It is indeed true that we cannot transfer to this country the wholesale education of Prussia; in the latter it is compulsory on parents to send their children to school, or to prove that they educate them at home. A compulsory obligation of that nature would, at this time, be too stern for England; we must trust rather to moral than legislative compulsion.”

*Appendix A.*, p. 382.

The rest we reserve for a future stage of our argument, as enough has been already drawn from M. Cousin and Mr. Bulwer to show that, for us, the example of Prussia is not an example in point.

So far then we seem to have arrived. The argument by which state education is demanded, altogether breaks down on the ground of precedents. Our case rather is strengthened by the witnesses of the opposite party. We did not call them, but we may claim their suffrage, and appeal to their testimony.

But other and, we think, more plausible, if not more valid, topics are brought forward than the authority and example of other nations or other times. State education is claimed for the people on the ground of *right*, on the ground of *expediency*, on the ground of *necessity*.

Yet few, perhaps, insist upon an absolute and abstract right. Nor can we see either how it is *possible* to prove that such a right

exists, political or natural; or again, what *advantage* there could be in proving it. The *right* even of physical subsistence for the poor by any legal provision is not strictly demonstrable; although here it may be urged that the state is instrumental in keeping subsistence for some and withholding it from others by the institution of *property*. Much less is there a positive right for demanding from the government a blessing, like knowledge, infinite in its amount, where there is no appropriation and no exclusion, and which none can *directly* engross or intercept. There is indeed so far a moral and religious claim, that it is an imperative obligation upon Christians and philanthropists to impart Christian and useful instruction to all who need it. But the profound and exquisite wisdom of Christianity places all these things upon the foundation of a *duty*, incumbent upon the donor as himself the debtor and steward of God, not of a *right* which may be *exacted* by the recipient. Besides, if instruction be a right which one party can claim from another, we could never adjust, amidst the infinite varieties and intricacies and gradations of human fortune and station, *who* is to claim it and *from* whom; and, certainly, it would hardly seem claimable from the state, of which the duties are rather negative than positive in their intrinsic nature. Unfortunately, too, if it be a right, it is one of the few which the poor evince little disposition to assert.

But the question, we know, will not be settled by these metaphysical refinements. The broad ground of expediency will be taken. It is argued that there are vast advantages afforded by the interference of the state, which cannot be secured upon the individual and voluntary principle. Here the first thing to be done is to put away the technical phrases of political economy and the authority of Adam Smith and his successors, whether on the one side or on the other. We quite allow that the argument of Dr. Chalmers, an argument since assumed by so many wearers, that it is becoming tolerably threadbare, is in a measure applicable to education as well as to religion. It is true, that as to the intellectual and spiritual, in contradistinction to the physical necessities of the human being, the demand has oftentimes to be created as well as the supply, and must partly be created by the supply itself; because the need will be unfelt wherever it exists in the greatest intensity. But it is a monstrous fallacy to infer, that if state education should not be introduced, the poor will then be left first to feel their want, and then to remove it, by any unassisted efforts of their own; because we say, that the demand and the supply may and will be called into existence by the agency of Christian associations and Christian individuals in the higher, more enlightened and more opulent ranks of the commu-



nity. And we assert further, and challenge disproof of the assertion, that without the cordial and strenuous assistance of such instrumentality, not only a national education provided by the state would prove a lamentable failure, but even a national religion connected with the state would be shorn at one blow of more than half its efficiency.

The following advantages, however, are claimed for state-education over the exertions of societies and individuals. 1. Uniformity. 2. Universality of extent. 3. Promptitude, vigour, and despatch. 4. An enlightened and philosophical comprehensiveness of plan. 5. A permanent stability and security from fluctuations.—We will say a very few words upon each of these points, in the order given.

1. Uniformity.—We altogether doubt the abstract use of uniformity; and we are sure that it cannot be attained without the sacrifice of much more than it is worth. We are inclined to believe that a much larger amount both of theoretical and practical excellence will be struck out of the collision, or elicited by the honest competition, of different and rival systems.

2. Universality of extent.—This advantage cannot be attained by the state more than by individuals, without a rigour in its enforcement which the people will not bear. Declaratory enactments would be ridiculous in themselves; if penalties were attached to them, the smile of contempt might be changed into a burst of execration.

3. Promptitude, vigour, and despatch, as attendant upon unity of operations which spring from a common centre.—But the promptitude and dispatch will altogether vanish, if the state undertakes a task too unwieldy for it to manage. The vigour, again, is an ingredient of arbitrary power, and can exist only in proportion as the state is armed with the terrors of the law.

4. An enlightened and philosophical comprehensiveness of plan.—It is difficult to conceive, in the nature of things, why the ideal personage, called the state, should be enabled to devise or communicate a plan more enlightened and philosophical than the best and wisest individuals of whom the community is composed. Again, as to comprehensiveness, it will entirely fail, on account of the fatal chasm which must be left in religion.

5. A permanent stability and security from fluctuations.—The instability, or the insecurity, or the danger of fluctuations, is, or may become, under the present system, infinitesimally small; but if a state be shaken by political convulsions, its schemes of philanthropy, its more quiet labours in the cause of social improvement, are, we again declare, always the first to suffer, and often become irretrievably deranged.

In truth, our conviction is that there is an element of vast importance totally and fearfully overlooked : we mean the *tremendous insecurity of education by the state*. Men talk of the certainty of legislative provisions: we believe that there is nothing more uncertain. Men talk of the stability and permanence of state measures, as contrasted with the fluctuations of individual charity: we believe that individual benevolence will in future be found a much more steady and abiding principle than state policy. We cannot legislate for the next generation; no, nor even for the next parliament. What! are there no instances of grants being diminished or discontinued? What! is there no tendency in the spirit of any late enactments to a poor and niggardly, a short-sighted and narrow-minded parsimony? What! is a wise and religious generosity so much the characteristic of the age? Are there no complaints? Has there been no resistance to the payment of other rates for purposes quite as sacred as any purposes even of national education? And if things the oldest and most venerable—things ingrained into the usages of the people, and fenced about by almost immemorial prescription—if *these* things are no longer safe, what guarantee can there be for the *continuance* of a system which will not have been interwoven or amalgamated with our other institutions, nor strongly fixed upon the affections of the country, nor hallowed by the sanctifying power of long antiquity? Who can say that sentiments like the following will not soon be uttered—"We are poor ourselves: we are oppressed by taxes and burdens heavier than we can bear: we can hardly maintain and educate our own children: we have nothing to do with the education of the children of other persons: let this work be undertaken by the rich and idle, who can afford to do it, and think it necessary to be done." We ask again, who can say that such language would not in a very few years be held by demagogues out of doors, distressed, discontented, or turbulent; and that their delegates would not be compelled to repeat it within the walls of parliament? In that case, what will happen? We shall have dried up or diverted the streams of private bounty; we shall have discouraged voluntary contributions, and chilled into ice the glow of individual exertion; we shall have deranged and dislocated a system which is widely and increasingly beneficial, and in its stead we shall have substituted an imposing but unsubstantial scheme, which falls to pieces about our ears, and leaves us to reconstruct the former machinery at an enormous toil, and under a thousand disadvantages. And this we are to do for the sake of avoiding insecurity! Our reply is, that of the two uncertainties—upon the supposition that there are *two*—we would infinitely rather trust to the oscillations of private charity, than place our

dependance upon legislative caprice. We have unquestionable misgivings as to what our legislators may wish to do, or what they may be forced to do. And the man who does not take into account the contingencies which we have just pointed out, must be as blind as an owl at noon-day to the signs of the times, and know absolutely nothing of the spirit which is exhibited at every public meeting, and in every vestry-room, from one end of the kingdom to the other. In a word, there is now a vast deal of religious and Christian feeling in the country, and also a vast deal of irreligious and selfish feeling: there is a vast deal of charitable beneficence, and also a vast deal of wretched, and mistaken, and debasing economy. If we turn over the task of national education from associations and individuals to the state, the result may be, that we shall transfer it from the former class of those feelings to the latter, and so place it in a state of alarming and almost hopeless peril: the result may be, that we shall dishearten, at least, if we do not shock and disgust its most tried and staunchest friends, and almost surrender it to the mercy of others, who will abandon *any* cause rather than pay for its support.

Believing then, as we do most conscientiously believe, that we can have no greater security that twenty years hence, or ten years hence, or five years hence, men will acquiesce in the utility of a state education, than we have that they will acquiesce in the utility of a state church, we should betray the interests of education, if we did not express our opinions at any hazard of misrepresentation or obloquy; and we are sure that we shall do an important service, if we can disabuse the public mind of an error grounded upon inapplicable theories and insufficient acquaintance with facts.

So much for the expediency of state education on the ground of its security and its permanence.

But there remains the argument drawn from *necessity*—necessity, that iron despot, which has no law, which allows no appeal, which suffers no evasion. If it be so, of course we can say no more. *Causa dicta est.* But when men declare that we cannot do *without* state education, our retort might at once be, that we shall do still less with it. But our wish is to speak with candour and openness, rather than make any display of intellectual gladiatorship. Our wish is, that the strongest light may be thrown upon the question, and its real merits ascertained.

It strikes us then, that there is a gradual and perceptible improvement; but that a certain kind of necessity exists, we have not the unfairness or the madness to deny. The Newgate Calendar itself—the state of our prisons—the record of crime and punishment—the whole annals of juvenile profligacy, that curse and opprobrium of the land—the appearance of our towns and vil-

lages, of our highways and bye-ways—of our streets, and alleys and suburbs—of the public places and thoroughfares in our metropolis, and of its obscurest haunts—still loudly and awfully proclaim that necessity. A necessity there is, a vital, a tremendous, an overwhelming necessity for an increased amount of Christian and philanthropic efforts in extending and universalising the education of the people. A necessity there will be, until every poor boy, and still more, perhaps, every poor girl, amongst us shall be trained in the best form of intellectual, and moral, and religious discipline; until they shall be saved from the contamination of bad examples and bad companions, and even, if it is possible, from the influence of flagitious parents; until they shall be rescued from a position of things which tends to crush or stifle all the germs of good, to develope and bring to maturity all the elements and capacities of evil, and, we might almost say, hand them over from a sinful and shameful life to a wretched and penal immortality.

If these admissions, which allow a certain kind of necessity, prove the necessity of education by the state, we make them, nevertheless, not merely with cheerfulness, but with an anxious and earnest solicitude. Let our argument be demolished, but let the right prevail. Contending, as we hope to contend, not for victory but for truth, not for any personal triumph, but for the welfare of our father-land, and for the secular and spiritual happiness of all its inhabitants, God forbid that we should shrink from making statements which we believe to be essential, because they may be turned as batteries against some of our own positions!

At the same time we by no means see that the necessity or the utility of education by the state follows as a logical deduction from the particular sort of necessity which we acknowledge to exist. Our antagonists indeed say, and seem to think the averment decisive, “in England the voluntary system of education has been tried, and such and such evils are prevalent; in Prussia legislative interference has been adopted, the same evils do not prevail to the same extent; therefore it becomes necessary that the former system should be changed for the latter.” We answer, that the fallacy has been already exposed of supposing that because legislative interference has been successful in Germany, it would be successful in England; we answer, again, that if the same evils do not prevail in Prussia, there prevail other evils as great; and, moreover, that like *partial* causes are not enough to produce like effects, unless there be a general parity of circumstances, and the same unimpeded facility for the operation of the causes; and, moreover, that there is now a steady progress towards the desired end, and that the end is ultimately secure of attainment; although

the rate of progress towards it ought, we allow, to be accelerated by all safe and wholesome expedients which can be devised. Yet, farther, the whole condition of the country must be regarded in one comprehensive and connected view. The ignorance of the poor, in whatever degree it is still found, is not its only misfortune, there must be added its pauperism—the distress which spreads over many of its interests—its excessive, or at least its thronged and clashing population—and even the license and excitement attendant upon its political freedom. We must, therefore, look to, a better system of poor laws—perhaps, to a well-devised scheme of emigration,—and to a wide course of judicious activity, as well as to a more general instruction. At any rate the evils have not sprung from a single source, nor are they to be healed by a single remedy. And even if they could be so healed, that single remedy would not be education by the state. For we shall show, almost immediately, that unless compulsory, it could not touch the present distemper; if compulsory, it would, in all human probability, create worse distempers than the present.

On all these points, however, we shall have more to say as we proceed to bring forward the evidence on our own side of the question; hitherto we have merely rebutted the evidence of our adversaries, and endeavoured to point out how the slightest test of cross-examination strips it of the chief portion of its applicability and force.

Our own evidence is twofold; comprising, 1st. The good which is now actually in progress by means of individual and voluntary exertion; and, 2dly. The evils which state education will inflict.

1st. As to the former point, we say boldly, that the magnitude of the good done is already enormous, and that it is receiving perpetual and almost daily accessions. The number of children already taught, and the amount of instruction already given, is, as Mr. Bulwer says, larger than is supposed; the increase of schools is at a rate which far outruns the increase of population; and the rate of increase is accelerating year after year.

As to the number of children taught, we must refer, having no space for the extracts, to pages 120—123 in the Report of the National Society for 1832; and that Society, we must remember, was not formed until the year 1811, which, with reference to the life-time of a nation, is only as yesterday.

According to the statement, the—

“*First Result* in 1819, obtained by means of circulars addressed to the Clergy of the Established Church, by order of Parliament:—Total, Sunday schools, 5,463; scholars 477,225.—N.B. The population of England and Wales in the preceding census of 1811, was 10,150,615.”

" *Second Result* in 1826, obtained by means of circulars addressed by the National Society to the Clergy of the Established Church, under favour of a free cover granted by his Majesty's government:—Total, schools, 8,399; scholars, 550,428.—N.B. The population of England and Wales in the preceding census of 1821, was 11,978,875."

" *Third Result* in 1832, obtained by means of circulars as on the National Society's previous inquiry in 1826:—Total, schools, 12,978; scholars, 900,025.—N.B. The population of England and Wales in the preceding census of 1831, was 13,894,574."

The increase, perhaps, cannot be very accurately ascertained from these *data*; because there may be omissions in the earlier returns. Nor will our knowledge on this branch of the subject be entirely satisfactory, until we have the opportunity of consulting the next official statement of the National Society, which will be made, we believe, at an interval of six years from the date of their last.\*

The statistical accounts of the aggregate of education are far, we admit, from being perfectly satisfactory, inasmuch as they are conflicting and perplexed. But this is a defect under which they labour in common with the whole statistics of the empire. We confess, therefore, that after looking over various statements of the numbers instructed, we can discover none of which the accuracy is ascertained and unimpeachable. Still the facts which we have stated stand out in bold relief; we challenge denial to them; for the proof we refer equally to the reports of the National Society, the British and Foreign School Society, and the Sunday School Union. We assert it too as a fact, for which the

\* After all, the argument for or against the interference of the state turns in great measure upon the progress which education has actually made, that is, upon the extent and nature of the system which must be disturbed by its interference. If that system is in the main good, and if it has spread and is rapidly spreading by means which alone have been used by the National Society and British and Foreign Society, (*viz.* the training of masters and mistresses for schools, the diffusion of information, and the voting of grants in aid of building school-rooms,) so that there is reason to think that by additional assistance from the state towards building rooms only the system might be brought to bear upon the whole country, then the experiment of interference is unjustifiable. The recent grant of Parliament is the kind of assistance contemplated, but its amount, except as a mere trial of the plan, is inconsiderable—not to say, contemptible. Should the plan be acted on more extensively, it will be advisable that aid should be given towards building *dwelling houses* for masters and mistresses of schools. It was very well for the National Society, while its means were so limited and inadequate to the demands made upon them, to say "we can only aid in the indispensable part of the project, *viz.* in building the school-room,"—but Government, if they take the measure up, have no such excuse drawn from limited funds—and the dwelling house for the master is not only a desirable addition, but one which is often indispensable in order to the permanence of the school; it is equal to an endowment (on an average of £5 or £6 a year) and is far better than such endowment, inasmuch as it secures the residence of the master on the spot. In the case of *mistresses of schools* it is of still higher importance. The spreading of girls schools under female teachers is a most important feature in the National Society's system of operations.



National Society is responsible, that the total amount of children educated in England and Wales, upon the principle of the Church, is certainly more than 900,000; and if the Dissenters boast that they educate an *equal* number, though we may doubt the fact, the gross amount will appear to be at least 1,800,000, between the ages of seven and fourteen. Again, the formation of infant schools is comparatively recent; and the manner in which they are spreading and multiplying through the land may be a source to every Christian patriot of the purest gratification.

The statements upon this subject in a contemporary Review are, we trust, the result of ignorance rather than of wilful and malignant representation.

*"It is notorious, that many schools once flourishing were allowed to drop from want of patronage, and others were not reported on, solely because they had fallen into a declining state. Again, the writer, in the 'Companion,' assumes, what the National Society does not affirm, and what indeed is quite inconsistent with the fact, that the vast proportion of Sunday school children are taught to read. Lastly, we find it impossible to distinguish, in the National Society's Reports, how many of the day scholars also attend the Sunday schools, and are thus reckoned twice: and this element of uncertainty extends over about half a million of the pupils."—Edinb. Rev. No. cxvii. p. 5.*

Here let us pause. "Does not affirm!" The Report of the National Society does positively make the affirmation; and the fact is most strictly true. "Find it impossible!" Impossible, only because the reviewer has not read the heading of any one page containing the list of schools. There are no children reckoned twice, who are not distinctly specified. And although we must allow that the numerical accounts of the British and Foreign Society and the Sunday School Union are often involved in obscurity and sometimes in inextricable confusion, the Reports of the National Society will be intelligible to all persons who are willing to understand them. Be it remembered, too, that besides the associations just named, many denominations of Dissenters have Sunday School Societies peculiar to themselves; and that *individual piety* is at work to a prodigious and unimagined extent in the cause of religious and moral education over the whole surface of the kingdom.

Places are mentioned like Tring and Aylesbury, where no school would have been planted but for the indefatigable exertions of an individual, John Hull. We find, in the books of the National Society, that Aylesbury has a good National Sunday School of 130 boys and 100 girls, formed in 1817. But let the fact be as our opponent asserts it. What does it prove? Why, that individual exertion *has* planted and *does* plant schools where they are wanted, either by itself, or with the assistance of a society.

Much again has been said of the failure and disappearance of schools once established. A pitiful tale is narrated about Henley-upon-Thames, where there happens to be a good National School formed in 1817, and still flourishing. If we had space we would go, by the aid of the books of the National Society, through the whole country, by county and by diocese, and show how unfounded is the outcry about the precarious existence of unendowed schools.\* A very few observations must now suffice.

Every one who calls on the government to interfere, thinks it needful to prove that the existing means for educating the people are wholly inadequate; or that where they are adequate they are wholly *insecure*.

With regard to the *insecurity* of schools, the question to be asked when a school fails is this, viz. whether the managers were possessed permanently of a school room *rent free*. If they were not, the temporary failure or suspension of the school furnishes no argument. If they had such a school room it *would* furnish an argument; but then there is this fact on record to show, at least, how seldom under such circumstances it will fail.

"The Committee observe with regret, that the schools have failed in *twenty-seven* places which have received pecuniary assistance from the Parent, or from some Society of its District Associations. They pledge themselves to use every exertion, during the ensuing year, for the revival of such schools, and trust that, when the circumstances are made known to the gentry resident in the neighbourhood, their representations for this purpose will be attended with the desired effect."†—*Nineteenth Report, Nat. Soc.* p. 12.

"Since the establishment of the Society (see p. 13 same Report,) in 1811, 74,500*l.* had been voted in aid of building school rooms, besides occasional grants of local societies amounting to 18,400*l.*" And how much of this had been spent, to present appearance, in vain? Why just seven grants on the part of the Society amounting to 175*l.*, and twenty grants from its branch societies amounting to rather less than the same sum. But these have not been spent entirely in vain, either if they were the means of promoting education for a few years in a desolate place, or if the exertions of the society have been sufficient to revive the schools. How far the committee have fulfilled their promises may be judged by reference to the Report for 1832; the next which contains a printed list of schools; because when schools have once obtained a grant, whether they continue to flourish or not, the name of the place always appears in the society's printed list with the grant against it. To what then are these twenty-seven

\* See especially the Tables, p. 106—8, in the National Society's Report for 1832.

† There are above 3000 places with Schools in Union.

grants now reduced. Out of six places which had grants from the parent society, in two the schools are revived; in a seventh the grant has been repaid; out of the twenty places to which the local societies had contributed about 175*l.* in fifteen cases the schools are re-established. In the remaining cases there is a prospect still that the institutions may revive. Surely these facts need only be stated, to show the absurdity of urging the insecurity of schools. While the desire of promoting education exists among the clergy, *i. e.* so long as there are ministers of the Gospel among us, they will continue to flourish and do their work,—and when (if ever) the spirit of Christianity dies away and the Church is overwhelmed by her foes, then schools will fail, in spite of an endowment of 24*l.* a year, as proposed by Lord Brougham,\* or of four times 24*l.* secured for ever by the most valid instrument which the law can devise.

Our contemporary, it is true, brings forward an extract from the National Society's Report.

"Unfortunately in many places containing thousands of families whose parents are members of the Established Church, no provision whatever exists for the education of children according to the principles of that church."—*Ed. Rev.* No. cxvii. p. 7.

. But this statement was made with an almost exclusive reference to the manufacturing and mining districts; and no one pretends that education in England has yet reached the ultimate point to which Christian associations hope to bring it.

Stronger testimonials, however, are adduced from the Reports of the British and Foreign School Society for 1832 and 1833, which more roundly declare, that, notwithstanding the exceptions of that and kindred societies, "*England is yet uneducated.*"

The phrase is intended to be very forcible—it is only very vague. But there are two things to be observed, First, it is the very business of a petitioner to make out a case of need; and, more especially, if a society happens to want money, it is led to an overstatement rather than to an understatement of the difficulties with which it has to contend; for it must show that strong efforts are absolutely demanded. Therefore the reports of a society, written for a particular object, must always be received with certain grains of allowance. Again, the British and Foreign Society has nothing to lose, perhaps much to gain, by declaring that England is "*uneducated,*"—although, if it be "*uneducated,*" what has that society been about?—because, if a state-education were to be instituted to-morrow, the principle on which that society is founded would flourish and be exalted; the principle of the rival society would be trampled to the ground.

\* In the Third Report of the Committee, 1818.

That in remote districts, where the habitations of the poor are thinly scattered, comparative difficulties and deficiencies will occur in the process of instruction, is a mere truism. Nor can the interference of the state remove these difficulties and deficiencies, unless the state should unexpectedly develop some extraordinary, mysterious, and hitherto occult power of annihilating space, and approximating separated spots, and stopping the winds and rains, and arresting the decay of clothes and shoes, and communicating to children a new capability of walking to a distance: for in these and sundry similar particulars are to be found the chief obstacles to the formation of schools in country parishes, and the collection and maintenance of a considerable number of scholars. It is thought, we know, and it has been asserted, that without a state-education, as well as a state-church, the inhabitants of secluded villages will remain "pagans" in knowledge, as they were once pagans in religion. But here the action of large influential societies appears entirely overlooked. The very use of such societies is to take the whole kingdom under their care; to find where the need is greatest, and to supply it; to almost equalize, as it were, the means and resources of a land, by bringing the affluence of one part to bear upon the poverty of another, and to circulate the life-blood of instruction not only through the mighty arteries of a country, but through its minutest and remotest veins. As individuals must form and maintain societies, so extensive societies, well organized, and well worked, may cause a kind of level in the distribution of universal benefit, and also prevent any serious fluctuations, through the caprice or death of individuals.

But then, we are told, in a village, or remote district, only one school can be supported; and that school ought to be on a liberal principle, of which all sects may reap the advantage; and not regulated by the exclusive notions of any particular society. We might surely reply, that, if there is only one school in a place, that one ought to be on the principles of the church, and not founded by the state on a principle adverse to the church. But, in point of fact, the one school, if there is but one, will be almost always established, according to the tenets either of the majority of the inhabitants, or of persons who possess the largest share of property and influence. In neither case is any great hardship likely to be sustained. In the country, indeed, if the school be a church-school, the practical grievance may be returned generally as *nil*. From Dr. Walmesley's evidence before the Committee of 1818, and from all that we have seen or heard, we are assured that the most conscientious dissenters very seldom entertain an objection that their children should partake of the benefits of schools formed upon the plan of the National Society. No tests are put; no

questions are asked, except the age of the child; and attendance at church, although usually expected, is not always enforced.

Again, let us look to the amount of the instruction given. Here we are attacked, both by Mr. Bulwer (who, as to the numbers taught, gives evidence in our favour,) and by our contemporary of a northern Review.

Mr. Bulwer says,

“ In the number of schools and of pupils, our account, on the whole, is extremely satisfactory. Where then do we fail? Not in the schools, but in the instruction that is given there: a great proportion of the poorer children attend only the Sunday schools, and the education of once a week is not very valuable; but generally throughout the primary schools, nothing is taught but a *little spelling, a very little reading—still less writing*—the catechism—the Lord's Prayer, and an *unexplained unelucidated chapter or two in the Bible*;—add to these the nasal mastery of a hymn, and an *undecided conquest over the rule of addition*, and you behold a very finished education for the poor.”—*England and the English*, vol. i. p. 304—306.

Mr. Bulwer, we believe, likes to be considered a man of fashion—an amateur author and editor—a gentleman legislator; and therefore we pass over with a smile his very natural ignorance upon such subjects as the actual amount of education extended to the poor children in the best of our national schools. He might have the charity to adopt the Aristotelian rule of judging of every thing by the best of its kind. Nay, we would engage to bring children from almost any one of them, who, in their knowledge of the Bible, so “*unexplained and unelucidated*,” and in their conquest not only over addition, but over the rule of three—although we expect soon to see added to their knowledge vulgar and decimal fractions and the first rudiments of mathematics—would puzzle him exceedingly, and put his science to the blush.

But what shall we say to men whose business it is to have better information?

“ In the National Schools, on the other hand, with a greater number of books on their list, nothing can be more meagre and stingy than the allowance of instruction doled out. It is comprised under the heads of Reading, Writing, and Ciphering. By the first is to be understood the faculty of pronouncing and spelling English words, not of comprehending their import, still less the structure or grammar of the language:—the reading is rigorously confined to one subject. The ciphering goes no farther than the first four rules of arithmetic: the writing may be cultivated to any extent of mechanical dexterity; for there is no limitation when the hand and not the head is to be exercised. Such is the sum and substance of the instruction given.”—*Edin. Rev.* p. 13.

Yet let us observe the different way of describing the same things, when applied to the primary system intended for *France*.

A system by no means more comprehensive is thus depicted in terms much more grandiloquent:

"It comprehends moral and religious instruction, reading, writing, the principles of the French language, ciphering, and an acquaintance with the authorized system of weights and measures."—*Edin. Rev.* p. 21.

Thus the classic story has its counterpart, and the mules are no longer the offspring of jackasses; but it is, "*Hail, daughters of the tempest-footed mares!*"

What again shall we think of the following extract?

"In the catalogue of school apparatus and of books made accessible in any shape to the children, we look in vain for any means of conveying general information,—any work, for example, of voyages and travels,—of natural or civil history,—or containing the elements of grammar or geography,—any map, but of the Holy Land, and that not always,—any means, in short, to stimulate and gratify the curiosity of a child,—to open his mind to mathematical truth,—to make him acquainted with the country he lives in,—its soil, surface, productions, traditions, or history,—or to attach him to any of its institutions, except the form of worship of the English church. So little, indeed, are the agreeable associations with the business of instruction cultivated, that we think it not improbable many an English peasant, who in his boyhood got all that these schools could give him, should be now unable to read."—*Ed. Rev.* p. 14.

What! did the writer of this malicious nonsense never hear of lending libraries, to which the boys and girls in our schools have access; and of which many of them rejoice to avail themselves? Is he ignorant that the object of these libraries is recommended and promoted by the National Society, and by the clergymen in almost all our populous parishes? Is he ignorant of all that the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge is doing? of all that the Strand Committee is doing? Did he never see the list of books upon their catalogue? Even of the routine of common school instruction, he seems to know nothing.

In short, when we mark the point to which things are tending, we sometimes anticipate an objection, whether just or unjust—that there is a disposition to *over* instruct, rather than *under* educate, the poor children in our national schools. The attention of the Committee of General Literature connected with the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge have turned their peculiar attention to the subject. Books have been compiled under their superintendence, in the departments of history and geography, which we have seen in actual use. The titles of others, with a peculiar reference to Sunday schools, we have prefixed to the head of this article. These are excellent in their kind. We cannot well desire any thing better. The introduction of the elements of political and social economy we know to have been suggested.



The following is even quoted by our cotemporary as an extract from the General Report of the National Society for the year 1833.

“ A conviction of the superabundance of time at the disposal of schoolmasters, has induced the managers of certain schools to seek for variety of employment. Hence the reading of works of History and Natural Philosophy, &c. in addition to the usual school-books, has been introduced in some places ; and in others, the study of English Grammar, or the learning of the notes and elements of Music, with a view to improving Psalmody, has been made to occupy a portion of the day.” — *Ed. Rev.* p. 17.

The candour with which the extract is introduced, may be judged by the subjoined remark which precedes it. “ A similar acknowledgment of the narrowness and inadequacy of the original constitution and present practice of the National Society, is *implied* in the following extract ;” whereas the object of the appendix is, to show that from the *first* the society contemplated the abundance of time which would be at the disposal of the children, after they had acquired a due and necessary portion of religious instruction ; and to illustrate one method of employing that spare time, namely, in works of industry.

When men are in the mood, it is almost as easy to hazard one assertion as another. Perhaps, therefore we ought to be grateful for the acknowledgment that the children in the National schools are taught to *read* ; the insinuation that they are *not* taught to read, would be quite as correct, as the insinuation that they are not taught to understand what they read. We are not such *optimists*, as to suppose, that the present state of education is the “ very best of all possible states ;” as the state of society, is not the very best of all possible states. Village-schoolmasters may still be found, who are not models of excellence in their profession ; as village-clerks may still be found, who would be considerably puzzled by a word of four syllables. But it would be hardly logical to universalize the proposition, and infer that the clerks attached to the churches in England are incapable of reading the church-service. Individual deficiency will occur, more or less, under all systems ; but we have even Mr. Owen’s evidence that the practice of instilling the *sense* of all, that is taught and read, is general and unexceptionable in our National schools.

But the amount of benefit cannot be reckoned simply by the number of national or parochial schools which are established, or the course of instruction which is pursued. The system of the schools is linked with the whole system of parochial government. The infant schools, the lending libraries, the savings’ bank, the visiting societies, are all carried on in connection with them, and, in great measure, by the same machinery, and under the same superintendence ; and thus not merely the clergymen are linked

to their parishioners, but the richer inhabitants are connected and bound together with the poor. And when we bear in mind, that the clergymen, as a body, were never so active in their respective districts as they are at this period, and that the best methods of parochial regulation were never so well understood, the danger of disturbing all this existing machinery must be evident to the most careless. But men who sit in their closets and write books, too often neither know the vast amount of good which is actually done, and the still vaster amount which is on the point of being attempted, by the wise benevolence of associations and individuals; nor can they conceive the mischief with which they may afflict the country, by substituting splendid but impracticable projects, unsuited to the institution of the government, and the genius of the people.

Such, it remains to demonstrate, is the scheme, as applied to England, of education by the state.

In England, as we have shown, education by the state is a mere *experiment*; we have also shown, that it is an *unnecessary* experiment. It remains to show that it is a most perilous experiment. If we make it, we launch upon a new ocean; and, alas, we can have no confidence in the pilots who will be on board.

In the first place, the people of England are certainly not accustomed to refer doubtful and complicated undertakings to Government, as the executive power; as far as is practicable, they prefer to keep them in their own hands. Protection, rather than *agency* is sought from the legislature; but individual enterprise is all-pervading and omnipotent. The people, to speak not so much of the rights, as of the facts of the case, are less anxious for an intermeddling, or what is called a *paternal* government, than for one which will leave all the members of the great household to pursue their own occupations, and push their own schemes of improvement, without interference or molestation. Least of all, do they approve a continual censorship and *surveillance*; quite satisfied that the government should interpose only by maintaining order, by affording security to person and property, by preventing individuals from wronging each other or the community, or by affording pecuniary assistance when exigencies arise. If we look throughout the country at its canals and rail-roads, its marvels of mechanical skill and toil, its works of utility and charity, its institutions of industry and science, we see every where stamped upon it the character of a free and active nation; a nation, loving its activity as well as it loves its freedom; and not the impress of a despotic and arbitrary rule, where all the authority and energy are centered in one focus; and where operations, however magnificent and serviceable in themselves, are

carried forward, as if the subjects were merely the implements of the head of the state. Often has it been witnessed among us, that the best way to spoil hopeful and promising undertakings, is to put them under the superintending control of the government. With us, a mercantile company, or a benevolent association, can do infinitely more than a commission or a *bureau*. So at least it has been in *old England*: if we are now to have a new England, or a young England, as our neighbours boast of their new France, or their "*young France*," we, for our parts, feel no strong appetite for a change, in which the very identity of the nation may be so far lost, that perhaps even the debts and obligations of one period will be not recognised in another, by a country which is no longer the same. We apprehend, nay, we cannot but discern, unspeakable danger, in attempting to alter the entire principle upon which our affairs have proceeded in conformity with the very bent and bias of the national mind; instead of preserving the *old* principle, but honestly endeavouring to ameliorate, and complete, and perfect the details. Let us beware, lest we drop the substance for the shadow; and forfeit all, by aspiring to grasp at once incompatible advantages. We might even remark, that the general process of the highest civilization is towards a species of self-government; that is, the more knowledge and enlightenment are equably diffused throughout a land, the more its inhabitants can do for themselves, and the less they require the positive interference of a legislature.

The expense of the plan will be such, as would perhaps hardly suit the economical temper of the times. In *St. James's Chronicle* for August 1st, 1833, we find the following statement in a report of Mr. Roebuck's speech upon the introduction of his bill in July 29th:—

"He would now proceed to some of the details of the proposed plan, as to the masters to be employed, and their remuneration. He was of opinion that these schools should be equally within the *reach of the rich as of the poor*. It was proposed by the present plan that there should first be infant schools, and that from them the children should go to schools of industry, the latter of which should be separately for boys and for girls. Then there were to be these schools of industry in every district, *the country to be divided into districts as in America*. The honourable member then stated that *in addition to the above* there were to be normal schools, the object of which was the instruction of the masters who were to teach in the other schools; these were all to be under the superintendence of a superior officer, and the honourable member stated that the good effect of the normal schools in France, since the revolution, had been very great. One advantage to be derived from this public tuition of the masters would be, that they would be raised to that rank in their profession which would be an inducement to them to embrace

it. In conclusion, the honourable member adverted to the expense of the proposed plan, and complained that the public monies of the country had been expended upon various objects of minor importance, while on a subject like that of education none had hitherto, on any large scale, been laid out."

The expenses of *such* a plan would indeed be formidable; and let the government be assured that when the gentlemen of the movement party have concocted a plan, they will not long be satisfied with any other plan than their own. The expenditure of the National Society will be found by turning to almost any Report; or particularly the Report for 1830, p. 13. A notion may be formed of the expenditure in Prussia, when we learn, that *there* necessitous parents are supplied with children's clothing, &c. *There*, besides the maintenance of the schools there is a fund for pensioning off old schoolmasters.

But where are the *resources* for all such things? what parish already burdened with poor-rates will wish to encounter this additional tax? As the matter now stands, when masters and mistresses of schools are sent from London, the farmers (and their superiors also) make inquiry whether they have a family, and refuse to engage them if they have several children, lest, possibly, the parish should have to encounter the expense of their support. And are these the men who will receive as a boon the announcement that henceforth their parish rate will have the burden of the schoolmaster certainly, and his children after him if he happens to die?

Yet, upon the whole, we are not disposed to make a bugbear of the expense; for we believe that whatever may be bestowed upon the religious and useful education of the poor will be more than saved in police, and criminal prosecutions, and the relief of pauperism. But we feel the difficulty of the question, "*How* could the government propose a tax for educational purposes, after withdrawing a grant for strictly religious purposes immediately connected with the propagation of the Gospel, and the promotion of Christianity?"

As to the men who vituperate a religious establishment in connection with the state, and yet advocate an educational establishment in connection with the state, we may surely smile at the gross inconsistency which they display; and, unless charity forbade us, we might hurl back with a deadly effect some of the taunts and contumelies with which we have been assaulted. To this state education then are all to contribute? What! they who are still obstinate in their incredulity as to the benefits of any popular education at all, are *they* to contribute? They, who dislike the principle of a *state* education, are *they* to contribute?

They to whom the particular method of state education which happens to be adopted is insurmountably obnoxious, are *they* to contribute? And can the very persons, who are the parents and patrons of such a scheme, talk of the very principle of a Church establishment as a rank oppression and an intolerable wrong. With what colour or pretence can they be guilty of a self-contradiction so extravagant and so barefaced?

Just let us suppose a specific instance in the conduct of these liberty-mongers. They go (at least the legislature by their intervention goes,) to some sour and sturdy person in decent circumstances, who loves his own money much better than the education of the people. "Sir, you must pay £2 per annum towards the new system of state education, introduced under the authority of parliament." The man refuses, with expressions not the most polite, and tells them that "all classes ought to educate themselves or their own children, or that the classes, which cannot, are better without education." His remonstrance is in vain, he must pay, or see an execution upon his premises.

The liberty-mongers, we will suppose, next go to the poor man with another kind of compulsion. "You must send your children to school." The man or his wife answers, "I have no wish to send them;" or "I won't send them;" or "I can't send them," "one is ill;" or "another has no shoes;" or "another has a job by which he earns 3s. a week." These cases avail nothing. The children must go to school, or the parents must pay a penalty, or go to the tread-mill. That the rich and the poor persons thus described would act rightly, we need not and do not assert. But these cases, which would not long remain *imaginary* cases, may at once show that in very many points there is nothing so despotic as the theory of modern liberalism, and nothing so arbitrary as its practice.

As to the expense, there is, to be sure, a much shorter process suggested by some persons, who can cut all the gordian knots of financial difficulty by the slashing sword of spoliation. It is merely to assume that corporate funds are abused, and charitable bequests perverted, and that the present distribution of revenues attached to cathedral establishments is a grievance to the nation, and the thing is done. Why should there be any hesitation in turning these streams of rich fertilization into the great channel of national advantage; when the only inconvenience is to reduce the income of a few pampered ecclesiastics to the proper dimensions, and cut down by a salutary curtailment the quantity of Greek and Latin which is taught in the land? We can only answer, that any such plan—not to call it a sacrilegious robbery—would at best proceed upon the fatal and unhallowed principle

of doing evil that good may come; and that even if it *could* save the people from an additional impost, which circumstance may *itself* be questionable, it would alienate from the cause of popular education the very persons whose support would be most valuable, if it be not entirely indispensable; and would connect the idea of diffused knowledge with the ideas of irreligious rapacity and flagrant injustice.

But another position is, we believe, that resources can be found for the education of the people, without laying *any* additional tax upon the public. But these considerations arise. If the money is saved in some other way—by a more economical management, as to the poor laws, for instance—and then applied to purposes of education, still the people are taxed to a certain amount, which otherwise might have been used for the general reduction of taxation, or which would have returned at once into their own pockets: and the turbulent and the discontented among the people, the thousands who care more for money than for either knowledge or religion, will soon discover that a tax is *continued*, even if it is not *made*, and that a saving is *prevented*, if no additional burden is *imposed*. Their will therefore *may* be, that the sums should be appropriated to some *other* purpose; and this may even be the case if the funds of cathedral establishments, or corporate endowments and schools, should be seized. And thus a derangement, if it must not be called a spoliation, of property, might not, after all, be made subservient to public instruction; for if they can be seized for one object, they may soon be devoted to another. In our view, we repeat, the cost of the system is almost the least important element of the calculation: but that it must *cost something*, and that the people must be taxed to the *amount of that cost*, are incontrovertible propositions: and when the penurious or the irreligious shall be told that the cost is ten times more than repaid in the diminution of other outlays, through the good conduct of an educated, as contrasted with an uneducated, population, they may still say, “Yes; but there were individuals ready and willing to procure for us the benefit without putting us to the first expense.”

There is, again, this difficulty with regard to the application of money derived from endowed grammar schools which may be defunct, and other similar sources. If these funds are fairly available for purposes of general education, they ought, as having originally belonged to *grammar schools*, to be made available for the education of a class much above the lowest; and correspond rather with the *mittenschule* of Prussia and the *écoles moyennes* of France, than with schools of primary instruction for the poor; or



otherwise, to say no more of robbery, there will certainly be misappropriation.

But is the expense the only consideration? Are there no other obstacles, let us ask, to the universality of education among the poor? The deficiency of funds stands, as to some districts, at the top of the list: and it is a remarkable proof of the eagerness, the energy, the vigour with which education may be prosecuted in the existing system, if adequate funds are provided, that in a very short space of time, upon the announcement of the intended grant by government, the National Society made application to the amount, we understand, of 26,000*l.*, and the British and Foreign Society to the amount of 16,000*l.* The returns have been presented to the House of Commons, but, without vouching for extreme accuracy, we believe that the foregoing statement will be found nearly correct.

At the same time it is a lamentable mistake, to imagine that a sufficiency of funds for building a school, paying a master and mistress, and discharging the current expenses, is all that is required. It is indeed all that the State can do; but there is a vast deal more to be done. There are scholars to be provided, as well as a master; and let no one suppose that all the existing schools are full, and, therefore, that if there were others, they would be full likewise. From all the evidence adduced before the various committees, it appears that many existing schools neither are, nor ever have been, filled; that from the incapacity or bad temper of a school-master or school-mistress, or from the desperate poverty, or recklessness, or indisposition of the parents, an almost insuperable difficulty is found in procuring and keeping the requisite number of scholars. In other places, again, schools are filled almost as fast as they can be built; there is a readiness, an eagerness, to obtain and even pay for instruction; and almost the only obstacle to the universality of education is the want of money or of room. So much depends upon the difference of localities or of personal exertion; so infinitely varied are the circumstances of the country, and so opposite are the difficulties that occur.

But we may go further: we may suppose schools established and organized—scholars collected—masters and mistresses appointed and at work—some central board of reference and administration constituted:—but the question comes, who are to undertake the task of constant and almost daily *superintendence*? Without that superintendence, be the masters who they may, the schools will not prosper long. We ask therefore again, from what quarter is superintendence to come? Then will it be found that the hearty concurrence and countenance of the clergy of the

Established Church is a *sine quâ non*—that very countenance which the whole plan, in its origin and its spirit, is constituted to preclude. No dependence can be placed for a continuance upon the lay members of the establishment; for their occupations, either of business or amusement, their migrations from one residence to another, or their alien habits, will interfere too much to make *their* attendance at the school the *staple* commodity, although a very useful addition. We suspect that, the clergy of the Establishment being disgusted and annoyed away, the superintendence will fall ultimately into the hands of Dissenting ministers. For all is a *gain* to the Dissenters, and a loss to the Establishment, in the state of things which we contemplate.

It is quite obvious to our minds that no Central Board, no apparatus of legislative provision, no interference of the state, could obviate these difficulties, or even insinuate itself into the nooks and crevices in which they lurk.

Yet there are not only difficulties but *impracticabilities*. This is proved by the contrariety of opinions, which exists among the advocates of state-education themselves. One publication is for introducing more of religion, another for introducing less; one is for compulsion, another is for non-compulsion; one for force, another for moral influence. The Review, to which we have already referred, says,

“As to the other provision, for *compulsory* attendance, we could not recommend it in any plan of English education; but should prefer trusting, as the French legislature has done, to persuasion, and the gradual growth of a schoolgoing habit among the people. Indeed, the Prussian law enforces attendance only where it is agreeable to the feelings of the people.”—*Edinburgh Review*, No. 117, p. 10.

This curious kind of voluntary impressment and non-compulsory compulsion would be, we fear, something too refined and subtle for the gross understandings of the English. And, what is still more curious, the impracticability of the plan seems to be allowed, in the very Review, and in the very article, which is at the trouble of traducing, and misrepresenting, and calumniating all present systems, for the purpose of recommending it.

“It is not to be disguised, that very formidable obstacles still stand in the way of the final settlement, by any great legislative measure, of this momentous question. The difficulty of trimming the balance between the friends of the Established Church and the Dissenting interest, was that which shipwrecked the Education Bill of 1820. That difficulty still exists, and is, we fear, as little likely to be got over now, as then. A measure more favourable to the Dissenters than that bill was, might probably pass the House of Commons, but would infallibly be thrown out in the Lords; while a measure originating in the Upper-

House of Parliament, which should give to the established clergy the same influence and controul which they had by the bill of 1820, would scarcely pass the Commons, and would certainly not be acceptable to the country at large. And if, to take a third supposition, a measure were introduced, which should leave the minuter shades of religious belief to be explained and enforced by parents at home, and by pastors in Sunday schools, in their parochial visitations, and from the pulpit—which should confine the part of school instruction regarding religion to the great doctrines which all Christians agree in—and should consider religion, in reference to children, as an affair rather of the heart than of the head, and religious impressions as still more important at that age than religious knowledge—such a measure would, in all probability, meet with furious opposition from the majority of both parties.

“In these circumstances, and in a country not very able, and still less willing, to bear the additional burden which the establishment of parochial schools necessarily implies, we fear that any attempt to carry through a general measure would still be premature.”—*Edinburgh Rev.* No. 117, pp. 26, 27.

“*Premature.*” It will always be premature, as long as the existing constitution of the country remains entire and unimpaired. A very few words will be enough as to the *impracticability*; and we shall then conclude by demonstrating, partly in conjunction with this topic, the *positive mischief* which the *attempted* introduction of education by the state is calculated to effect among us, both in what it must *undo*, and what it must *do*. The project would assuredly fail, and would cause deplorable, perhaps irremediable, evils in the progress of its failure.

Both these points will be made out, if we consider that there is an absolute series of dilemmas involved in the plan. It must, in spite of our ingenious contemporary, be either compulsory or non-compulsory: it must be either on the same principle as the established church or *not* on the same principle as the established church: it must either teach religion, or not teach religion: it must embrace in its sphere, either the whole education of the country, or only a part.

If it is to be non-compulsory, the whole scheme will be nugatory and abortive; perhaps, the very smallest mouse that mountain ever produced. The state, the mere state, thus reduced to a metaphor and a name, cannot effect more than the present methods used by individuals; nor, if it meets with the hostility instead of the co-operation of the clergy, one tenth part so much. The people, already jealous of the rulers and their intentions, will look upon it with misgiving and suspicion: they will imagine that some sinister objects are contemplated, which are not avowed: if the government becomes unpopular, the government education

will share in its unpopularity, and by that unpopularity be shaken to atoms.

If it is compulsory, of what nature is the compulsion to be? Are the little urchins to be dragged to school every morning and afternoon by the police? Or are the names of the refractory to be reported to the Central Board? Or is the responsibility of sending them to fall upon the parents? And, if the mother wishes to keep a girl at home to help her in washing, or attending a sick child, and the father prefers to earn something by the boy's labour, how are they to be punished? What is to be the penalty for neglect? Is it to be a fine for the first offence, and imprisonment for the second, and transportation for the third? Why, in many districts of the country, the very mention of such a plan would be received either with a hoot of contempt, or a yell of indignation. The gift of education, so accompanied, would be rejected as an abomination and a nuisance. To compel registration, where the thing is done once for all, may not be found easy; to compel education, where the sense of compulsion will recur every day, is an undertaking from which the boldest might shrink. And if, at a period, when harsher measures must be adopted in the administration of the poor laws, a compulsory education should be added as another grievance, we would not answer for the consequences.

It is the nature of all men--and, above all men, of Englishmen, to turn with distaste from every thing compulsory; even, as we allow that education would be, a compulsory *benefit*. They might like to send their children to school; and yet would say with Falstaff "But not on compulsion, if reasons were as plenty as blackberries." And what would the champions of compulsion say, if Christian men, women and children were compelled to attend Church *only once a week*, upon pain of mulct or incarceration?

Is the plan to be on the principle of the Established Church? If it be, invectives, denunciations, derision, menace, with all kinds of active opposition, would rain in a pitiless storm of ten-fold violence. But on this branch of the alternative it is needless to say more. The plan is NOT to be put on the same principle as the Established Church: nor do the clergy ask it: nor do the friends of the Church require it. But if it be put on an opposite principle, what happens? A State-Church on one principle, and a State-Education on another, cannot co-exist. Even now, from the fury of its enemies and the pusillanimous lukewarmness of many among its friends, the Church can hardly maintain its ground. The great catapult to ensure its destruction will be, the establishment of state-education on a principle adverse to its pretensions.

We say without scruple, that the state-education, if undertaken at all, will be undertaken on a principle of dissent. There are too large societies now at work, which proceed by different paths, but have for their common object the instruction of the people:—the National Society, which is avowedly attached to the Church of England; and the British and Foreign School Society, which includes all sects and denominations of Christians. Now, we are not contending which principle is right and which is wrong; but we do most unequivocally affirm, that the state-plan would adopt the fundamental principle of the one society, and throw overboard the fundamental principle of the other. For it would train up the English poor, without any direct view or definite reference to the Church by law established—the Church connected with that very State, which would yet set on foot a system of education palpably at variance with the very essence of the Church. The anomaly is so monstrous, that we can hardly trace it upon our paper without a confusion of words and language.

Again, is the state to teach religion, or not to teach religion? Mr. Bulwer informs us that it is; and informs us that the philosopher ought not to object to religious instruction more than the divine ought to object to secular or useful instruction?

“Would the philosopher agree to this? No, indeed, nor I neither. Why then should we ask a greater complaisance from the ecclesiastic; he cannot think, unless he be indeed a mercenary and a hypocrite, the very Swiss of religion—that religious knowledge is less necessary than civil instruction. He cannot believe that the understanding alone should be cultivated, and the soul forgot. But, in fact, if we were to attempt to found a wholesale national education, in which religious instruction were not a necessary and pervading principle, I doubt very much, if public opinion would allow it to be established; and I am perfectly persuaded, that it could not be rendered permanent and complete. In the first place, the clergy would be justly alarmed; they would redouble their own efforts to diffuse their own education. In a highly Christian country, they would obtain a marked preference for their establishments; a *certain taint and disrepute would be cast on the national system*; people would be afraid to send their children to the National schools; the ecclesiastical schools would draw to themselves a vast proportion—I believe a vast majority—of children; and thus in effect the philosopher, by trying to sow unity, would reap division; by trying to establish his own plan, he would weaken its best principle; and the care of education, instead of being *shared* by the clergy, would fall almost entirely into their hands.”—*England and the English*, vol. i. pp. 386—387.

But then how far is the religious instruction to extend? To whatever point it extends, at whatever point it stops, some

feelings will be offended, some principle will be invaded, some occasion will be given for dissatisfaction and discontent.

Mr. Bulwer asks, "that which Prussia effects in this respect, why should not England?" For the answer to this question, we turn to another contemporary publication; believing the fact to be as it is there stated, and declining to enter into the argument, what the fact *ought* to be.

"When we consider the entire *absence* of theological controversy on the continent of Europe; in Italy and Spain, on account of the slavery of the press; in France and Germany, on account of the state of opinion; it is astonishing to contemplate the activity and violence of the religious contest kept up in this country. Every sect maintains its periodical works, its magazines, its reviews, and its newspapers. A large part of our modern literature consists of polemical divinity."—*Foreign Quart. Rev.*, vol. xii. p. 295.

Inexperienced persons may conceive that all differences of religious opinion may be harmonized in a school by a judicious system of class books. What says the Bishop of Llandaff in his admirable Charge:—

"Every experiment that I have known for blending discordant religious elements in one system of education has failed. The result is, either a laxity of doctrine, or a neglect of religion, or a clandestine struggle for ascendancy in some of the component parts at the expense of others.

"If the doctrine of the Church, after every concession that can reasonably be made, is not allowed to be *characteristic* of the institution, it seems to me by far the wisest way to form distinct schools, in which the doctrines and discipline of each party may respectively be taught. It is more likely to preserve harmony and mutual respect and good-will; and it will at least obviate the construction to which the other scheme is liable, that we think lightly of the differences existing between ourselves and the various sects by which we are surrounded."—*Bishop of Llandaff's Charge*, pp. 32, 33.

"Let us accomplish," says Mr. Bulwer, "our great task of common instruction, not by banishing all religion, but by *procuring* for every pupil instruction in his own." But state-education, instead of procuring it, will withdraw it: or, at least, will entirely preclude the notion, that one form of Christianity is better than another, and therefore that the creed of the Churchman is better than that of the Sectarian. And we hazard the prediction, that let education in this country be undertaken by the state, and from that moment it will become a party and polemical question; for such are the elements which, among us, draw and assimilate all things to themselves. It will become a stalking-horse of political rancour, and theological irritation.

"Oh! but Church and state may act together, and the govern-



ment schools may come into play simply as an adjunct to the schools already established." Here, unfortunately, is still another dilemma. Here, again, if the state does any thing, it must do either the whole or a part. We are not speaking, be it remembered, of the government as addressing itself to supply some local and temporary emergency, but as undertaking a plan of instruction for the poor children of England. Now, unless its operations are conducted on a large and magnificent scale, they will be unworthy of itself, and tend to bring it into ridicule. Men will turn with a smile from the magnitude of individual exertion, to the miserable pettiness of the state achievements, nearly as when the European monarchs, in 1814, after viewing the splendid structures with which the associated capital and spirit of private persons had spanned the Thames, asked "where then was the bridge, which the state had constructed?" and were shown the little wooden, painted, Chinese affair, with its jingling bells, and gingerbread ornaments, which was thrown over the Serpentine. We have no wish to see the dignity of the state lowered. In such a case as general education, either it ought not to interfere at all, as a party *responsible* for the issue; or it ought to interfere upon some fit and necessary occasion; and then interfere with universality and authority.

On the other hand, if it does interfere with universality and authority, the solid and compact mass of existing instruction must yield, and crack, and dissolve away, like ice.

Again, is the plan to include in its sphere the whole education of the country, or only a part? The philosophical politicians, *par excellence*, demand that it shall, like the Prussian scheme, embrace all classes and grades of scholars; all sorts of seminaries and establishments for education. Every smaller project they, upon logical principles of reasoning, think insufficient and self-contradictory; but others, upon principles of common sense, hold *their* scheme to be wild and impossible.

Then we step into a labyrinth of confusion, when we ask, if the board is instituted, how far is its jurisdiction to extend? Is its authority to embrace only the new schools, to which the state is father and god-father, or the whole education of the country? the education of the poor only, or the rich as well as the poor—all endowed schools, or all charitable schools, or all schools without exception? Are the clergy to refer their proceedings, in the superintendence of their own parochial establishments, to a board, composed perhaps of theorists, who know no more about the internal organization and peculiarities of an English parish, than about the bottom of the Pacific Ocean?

There is yet *another* dilemma, the plan must be either uni-

form or not uniform. If it be not uniform, it loses its character; it loses all that constitutes to the eyes of its admirers its attractiveness and its grandeur; it becomes not one plan of state education, but a number of fragments and scraps of plans, without regularity or cohesion. If it be uniform, it must well nigh exclude religion, by excluding the differences of religion. Nevertheless, from all we hear, we must assume that it is to be uniform.

Again, *another* dilemma comes. The government must have the clergy either for them or against them. Here *how* should the clergy be *for* them? but if they are against them, it seems generally agreed by M. Cousin and the other writers on the subject, that the plan is impracticable. In truth, if the connection between Church and State were dissolved to-morrow by a bill of divorcement, and the Episcopalians of England were merely a sect, even then, without their concurrence and countenance, the operations of the government in introducing a plan of national instruction would be crippled, if not defeated.

If, then, the system is attempted, what will be the result? In the first place, a strong and most conscientious resistance will be offered by the ministers and friends of the Church of England. As one evidence of this fact, for it is a fact, and not a prophecy, we may state our knowledge that many parties, who made application for a share in 'the government grant of £20,000, put the question to persons most conversant with the matter, whether by receiving it they should place themselves and their school under the control of the state; because, as their determination was expressed, they would rather decline the grant than accept it upon such conditions. And let ministers be assured, that a large majority of Churchmen, seeing in the proposed scheme a blow, and perhaps a death-blow aimed at the Establishment, will feel it as a religious duty to intercept and frustrate, rather than assist it.\*

\* One Clergyman, indeed, the Rev. John James Taylor, has advocated the project. "The Times" quoted him; and the next day appeared in the same journal (January 28th, 1834,) a letter from Robert Owen, claiming the praise of having originated the whole plan, and been the first person who recommended it to Holland and Prussia. He then proceeds to eulogise "the truly useful practical Sermon of the Rev. John James Taylor, a very large, and the most essential portion of which is in the spirit, and in a great degree in the very letter of what I most earnestly urged the government to adopt in 1813, as the only means by which a permanent improvement would be effected in this or in any other country."

We wish the Rev. John James Taylor joy of this praise; though it comes from a quarter from which we should hardly expect to have an eulogium upon the doctrine or conduct of any English clergyman, with the exception of Dr. Wade. Let Mr. Taylor make the most of it; he must not expect much from any other. Whether he was right or prudent in carrying up into the pulpit his plagiarisms from Robert Owen we shall not stop to decide?

The "Times" says that not *Robert*, but "*Frederick*" the great, was the author of this scheme. Whether it were Robert or Frederick, either of *them* would be consistent.

What, then, is to be the spectacle? Are we to see Church-schools and State-schools set up in rivalry one against the other? Are we to see the former stocked with juvenile dissenters, and the latter with the children whose parents are attached to the Establishment? Will this spectacle be seemly or salutary? Or, if the Church retires from the indecorous conflict, are the new schools, which will be, in point of fact, almost seminaries of dissent, to grow up and flourish under the tutelary patronage of the three estates of the realm?

In that case, we repeat, state-education *must* disturb the existing system to its centre, nor can any degree of care or caution prevent this derangement. Make the law provisional: say that it is simply to be a trial on a moderate scale and for a time; still an irrevocable blow will have been struck at the character, and therefore at the efficiency, of all existing operations. Much will have been done to damp individual energy, to check and benumb individual ardour, and either to destroy the spirit at least with which the labours of individuals and associations are pursued, by surrounding them with uncertainty and gloom; or work them up to a determined and systematic opposition against the measures of the government, in points where opposition would be as unbecoming as mischievous, and where success must depend upon the most cordial agreement.

The proposed plan must be inimical to the authority of the Church in *two* ways; that is, both in the materials of the design, and in the agents who are to carry it into execution. Its principle, as we have fully detailed, is diametrically an antagonist principle to that of a dominant and established form of religion; and the parties to whom the general direction of the education of the country is confided, will no longer be, as heretofore, the ministers of the Established religion. Their supremacy will be annihilated; and they will hardly like, it is probable, to be sharers by mere sufferance in the work which was formerly their own, their influence practically slighted, and their peculiar tenets practically vilified. No: the education of the country is *intended* to fall, and will fall, into other hands. No Englishman, then, who would uphold his ecclesiastical establishment, can with consistency encourage the project of education by the state, if we are right as to its character. There are many reasons indeed why we, in our ignorance, prefer a state religion to a state education. The former we possess, the latter is *in nubibus*. The former is interwoven with our history, our habits, our earliest associations, our best and holiest feelings: the other is an imported novelty, with which, after all, our climate may disagree. The former is *co-ordinate* with the state, and cannot be made subservient to evil;

the other is a subordinate instrument, and *may* be used as an engine for purposes the most injurious. The former is confined to a few definite articles, fixed and invariable: the other ranges over a vast area of progressive and fluctuating knowledge. The former, being already ours, more than supersedes the necessity of the latter.

But to proceed; as the scheme would almost immediately be subversive of the Established Church, so ultimately it would be fatal to the religion of the country. The generalities—the *moralities* of religion would be retained: but the sublime and mysterious doctrines of Christianity would drop one by one away. The topic is invidious: but we unhesitatingly declare, that it is capable of strict and positive proof.

That the projected interference of the state must tend to disconnect divine from human knowledge, religious from secular instruction, in the great process of education, and the general discipline of the mind and heart: that it will expose *religious* education to the very casualties from which it seeks to exempt all other education, as if it were the least important of any: that it will leave religion to be taught either by the parents, who too often have neither time to teach it, nor ability, nor inclination; or by the clergy, whom the whole plan must either distress or exasperate:—that religion, too, ought not to be taught merely by itself, on the Sunday, or on extra-hours, as if it had no connection with all knowledge and all practice; or as if it were a matter too much involved in doubt and difficulty to become an integral part of the common and general tuition—that the religion of the scheme, therefore, could not be exactly that by which the most estimable men in the country could be satisfied: for that their piety, without being either very voracious or very fastidious, could not be contented with either the quantity or the quality proposed; and that the whole scheme, under a semblance of liberality and grandeur, is altogether narrow and unphilosophical—all these points, alas! are as obvious, as they are bitter, to our minds.

Such a result the project of state education must have a tendency to produce in more ways than one. All the schools—the schools of the National Society, for instance—will be disorganized; their scholars will, in part at least, be taken away; and, as to the members of the association themselves, apostacy may thin their ranks, and even bankruptcy threaten their funds; for what guarantee is there that men will come forward with donations and subscriptions when they are taxed into the bargain? Or, perhaps, the Society, like supplanted manufacturers, will transfer their capital, and machinery, and experience to some other quarter; they will devote themselves perhaps to the esta-

blishment and maintenance merely of *Sunday* schools. But still it becomes a question, whether they will be able to collect the children on a Sunday, when their influence over them has been weakened, and, perhaps, almost obliterated during the rest of the week. Again, from the multiplicity and importance of other engagements, the clergy are often really unable to bestow much time on Sunday upon the school: and, unquestionably, Sunday schools *alone* will never be sufficient to keep up *their* superintendence over the general progress of the education of the poor. Moreover, as we have just said, even the pecuniary means may be no longer at their command. In any case, however, there will be a shock to the Ecclesiastical Establishment, because the government is to evince its "*impartiality*," and it must be proclaimed throughout the land that the state does not deem it essential or advisable to train up the rising generation of the poor in the distinguishing principles and doctrines of that Church with which it is itself in communion; there must be a shock to the religion of the country, because it will be proclaimed, that religion is the only thing which is not *thoroughly* taught; and that after a certain point,—which point, if the scheme cleaves rigidly to its fundamental principle, can be barely beyond atheism,—the state is not to feel any concern.

This fact would be painful, if the state were obliged to encounter the evil; it is dreadful, when the state goes out of its way to inflict it. The evil is now in a very great measure avoided; because separate schools can instruct the children of different persuasions in their different peculiarities of faith; but the state could not provide masters for all the several sects; and, besides, in the very attempt, it would sacrifice that splendid uniformity, which is one chief glory of the design. If, in conjunction with these considerations, we bear in mind, that strenuous exertions are being made to admit dissenters to the benefit of degrees at Oxford and Cambridge, and that a charter is loudly demanded for the London University, which, as Mr. Bulwer remarks, teaches *no* religion whatever, because it is to be of *all* religions; we cannot but entertain a sober and well-grounded, not a frantic or cowardly, apprehension, that there exists in certain quarters an intense wish entirely to sever and cut asunder the constituted education of the country,—the education of the lowly as well as the high, and the rich as well as the poor,—from the constituted religion of the country.

We are told even by the Northern Review, "sometimes a new school on Bell's, or Lancaster's principle, would start up, ruin, and disperse some half dozen schoolmasters, and be then allowed, by the cooling zeal of the local committee, to go to pieces itself

and disappear!" And could the state perform no similar achievement? is there no possibility that the state could *ruin and disperse* the present schools? and, if its own machinery goes to pieces, in what situation should we be left?

The time has been—our notions of English liberty being grosser and more vulgar—when the idea of a legislative education, accompanied, as it must be, with a kind of domiciliary inquisition into the private habits of the poor, would by no means have suited the stomach of an Englishman. Even now, we have our doubts, whether, even if the compulsory part of the plan be put aside, the popular mind is sufficiently imbued with refined and scientific principles of freedom, to relish its general character. We imagine, that it will at least afford a pretence for raising a clamour against dictatorial interference, calculated only for the meridian of despotic states; and if this opinion once thoroughly impregnates and agitates the political atmosphere, the whole design will be ship-wrecked almost as soon as it is launched. This is, indeed, the note which has been already sounded by Mr. Cobbett and his school. With such persons the notion will never be palatable, that the poor should be drilled and dragooned to school by the government, and indoctrinated with whatever notions it may please to instil; and we shall be continually told of a parallel between ourselves and continental despotisms: or even between our authorities and Napoleon, upon whom the name of "*Undertaker general*" was bestowed by the working classes, and under whose reign, we are informed by Sir Walter Scott, "*Political franchises, individual interests, the property of municipalities, the progress of education, of science, of mind and sentiment, all were usurped by the government.*"

We say, then, that no alteration is required, and therefore the proposed plan is superfluous: we say, too, that the proposed plan is saturated with danger, and therefore cannot be expedient: it would be a Pandora's box of evils, without even the hope at the bottom. Indeed, the hostility to the Church is involved in the principle of the plan: the delicacy and intricacy of its details, with the certain collision and dispute which they would occasion, the impossibility of pleasing all parties, and the very strong probability of pleasing none; the risk of discontinuance, and therefore the positive and fearful mischief of displacing or weakening what already exists; the want of congeniality with the spirit of the people, and the circumstances of the times, the inevitable evil, either of inefficiency or tyranny, as the project shall assume a compulsory or non-compulsory character, with the hundred embarrassments sure to accrue from undefined magnitude, and unforeseen, uncalculated, difficulties: all these are heads,



upon which, if our limits would allow us, we could write long chapters of opposition to the contemplated scheme.

We see enormous peril and positive evil in chilling that glow of religious philanthropy, which is the very boast and bulwark of the nation; in stopping or exhausting that current of individual charity, of which the numerous institutions are the distinctive and moral ornaments of England.

On the other hand, the evidence of numbers is on our side; but it is not in the statistical tables of the past and present that we are inclined to place our greatest reliance. The future opens before us wider, and, we think, brighter prospects.

When we reflect how large a portion of the intellectual improvement of the country has been the growth of the last twenty years; and how large a portion of the literature of the country is now directed to the poor, as well as how widely, how universally, intellectual tastes and habits are diffused among the higher classes; when we think of the strength of religious feeling, which, amidst much of levity, and profaneness, and worldiness, is assuredly a marked feature of the age; when we know the intense interest, which is not merely manifested, but felt, on the subject of popular instruction, and may adduce in illustration of it even the present advocacy of education by the state; when we reflect upon the impetus which must be communicated to the public mind, even by the existing agitation—and on that account we are very far from lamenting or deprecating it;—we see no reason for entertaining a doubt that unless some violent stoppage occur, knowledge will be universally diffused at no distant period. The impulse is imparted, and the result is certain. Mental cultivation must propagate itself. Its seeds must be multiplied as well as reproduced. Mental enlightenment, when it has once taken root, must increase in a geometrical—nay, more than a geometrical, an almost infinite ratio. All stimulants, such as legislative interference, will, we are firmly convinced, retard and encumber, rather than assist, its growth. Let the present system run with an uninterrupted current, and we guarantee the issue, that the rich will become more and more anxious to bestow the benefit of education, and the poor to receive it. They who have been taught, will be eager to secure for their children, in after-life, the same blessing, which will have been the best resource and solace of their own existence; and when the majority are instructed, the rest will be ashamed to remain ignorant. Every conquest will afford fresh facilities for obtaining more.

In short, if they are treated with confidence and kindness, the ministers and friends of the Church will be ready, we believe, to make themselves responsible for the event. *Here, at least, they*

ask for no exclusive privileges. They merely desire, if the legislature furnishes pecuniary grants, to participate in them according to their fair proportion, and for the rest they say "*laissez nous faire.*"

There is another point, which deserves to be retaken into consideration, and of which the effects will be soon discernible in a surprising degree. For years a sharp struggle has been carried on against the strong-holds of a blind and proud dogmatism, in order to prove that popular education is a good. The battle has been fought, and, we may say, won. Almost the last enemies are now quitting the field, like the last snows that melt away before the sunbeams. That step has been gained, and in that step all has been gained. But, let us remember, it has been only just gained. We have only begun to reap the fruits of the conquest. Let us remember also, that, on the one hand, until the instruction of the people was generally recognized as a public advantage, the attempt to introduce education by the state must have been a chimerical and visionary madness; but that, on the other hand, the very acknowledgment is almost sufficient in itself to do away the necessity of the introduction.

Is, then, the existing number of schools adequate to the wants of the population? We answer, no. But, then, it is becoming every year more and more adequate, and the supply is likely at no distant period to overtake the need. And even now the deficiency is chiefly in the amount of Sunday schools; a deficiency which, of all projects in the world, a state education is least calculated to remove.

Again, is the *quantum* of instruction now given to each child as much as *might* be given, and given with advantage? To this question, also, we are inclined to reply in the negative. It is very possible, that, if the sphere of instruction were enlarged, every part of it might be better and more easily filled up. The very variety might assist and strengthen, as well as relieve the mind; and if there were added the rudiments of history and geography, and even of vocal music and mathematics, the things which are learnt at present might be taught with more pleasure, and to a greater extent. But then this improvement is already begun, these elements are already introduced; nor is there any conceivable reason why the agency of individuals and societies should not be as competent to make any useful and practicable adjunct to the tuition of the poorer classes of children as the agency of the state. Moreover, it cannot be too emphatically averred, that the quantity of instruction, which at the most cannot be very much, is of infinitely less moment than the *quality*. The *modicum* of history or geography which can be acquired, is of infinitely less

moment than the proper training and discipline of the understanding and the heart. Teach a child to read, and write, and cipher;—above all, let him be early imbued and penetrated with the lessons of the word of God; and all else, though positively a good, is comparatively nothing. Only give him the keys and instruments of ulterior knowledge, and the habit and facility of acquiring it, and the principles, which will direct and sanctify it, and he will be enabled to do the rest for himself. Thus in after life he has within himself an unlimited power of intellectual cultivation: he has within himself the means of alleviating toil, and an exhaustless store of resources against weariness and drunkenness in the intervals of leisure. You have put him on the first step of the ladder, and he can climb by his own efforts to the top.

At present there is a steady and progressive rise of a solid and well-cemented edifice, capable of containing all the poor children in the land: it is possible that the State Educationists may build more rapidly, but they will only build a Tower of Babel.

At the same time we feel no regret, for our own parts, that the outcry which has been raised in favour of education by the state should have come to arouse the energies and quicken the exertions of the friends of the existing system. It is well that they should know what the alternative before them really is. It is no other than this: either they must come forward with voluntary subscriptions and other personal efforts to complete, with a thorough efficiency in all its departments, the scheme of national education which they approve; or they must pay a compulsory tax in order to support a new project of education, which they conscientiously deprecate, as dangerous, or fallacious, or impracticable in itself; and as likely, in its conjunction with other circumstances, to assist the overthrow of the most venerable institutions in the land. They *must* make their election. If they sit with their arms folded and do nothing, their cause is lost. If they do nothing but complain, when complaint is too late to be availing, they deserve that it should be lost.

Our sorrow, then, we had almost said our honest indignation, will be too big for words, if the friends of religion and the Church shall be found wanting to themselves and their cause by neglecting their solemn duty to the people, by not providing an education altogether adequate in its kind and its amount to the wants and capacities of the poor. That the lower orders, who cannot or will not educate themselves, should be furnished with a proper and sufficient instruction is, we would most emphatically repeat, a solemn and imperative duty; but we still think, it is not so much

a political duty as a Christian duty, not so much a duty belonging to the state as a duty attaching itself to affluent and enlightened individuals. We have done our parts, let them do theirs.

We think that almost a new æra may be called into existence. The element of national feeling and Christian sentiment must be aroused.

As far as our means can be of influence or use, we shall bring the might of the press and of *public opinion* in aid of pecuniary contributions and personal exertions. So far from seeking to keep back the real state of the facts, we are determined to impart to them all the publicity in our power. We should like to make an examination throughout the kingdom: and wherever we find a place destitute of schools for the poor we could almost wish that the place should be marked. If it has not the means of supporting a school, it ought to be assisted; if it has the means, it ought to be shamed if it cannot be persuaded into an enlightened and patriotic benevolence. The country *must* be educated. Let the most searching questions be put; let the statistics of the subject be accurately ascertained; let all possible improvements be introduced; let the central, or model, or, as they are now called Normal schools of the National Society, and other institutions, if they possess them, be improved; let good class-books be prepared. We quite agree with Mr. Mayo in his Preface to "the Teacher."

"Whenever improved principles of popular education are advocated, this difficulty is invariably started, 'where shall we find persons competent to execute these views?' Men must be trained, they must be taught to teach, educated to educate. We have had enough of books adapted to disguise the ignorance of the teacher and perpetuate that of the pupil; we must now form men; we must bring the living mind in contact with mind, the living heart in contact with the heart. Whenever the government of the country shall be fully persuaded that an *improved* as well as extended system of education is the greatest boon they can bestow on the people, schools for teachers will doubtless be formed."—p. x.

But if our space were not absolutely exhausted, we could show that this object is by *no means* neglected under the *existing* arrangements.

In short, we have thus felt ourselves called upon, since the task has not hitherto been undertaken on an adequate scale by abler persons, to conduct, almost in a legal and forensic manner, the mightiest and most vital cause which can engage the universal mind of man. That, having a conscientious conviction in the truth of our own views, we are anxious to see them triumph, it would be the merest affectation to deny; but we can declare again, with a solemn sincerity, that our solicitude is ten-fold stronger, whether

our opinions are proved to be right or proved to be wrong, to see some approach made to the solution of that magnificent problem.—What is the best and most efficient mode in which THIS country can be educated?

Let us only trust that men will not be led away by a mere array of specious common-places, and decide without either taking into consideration the particular circumstances by which the result must be modified, or looking at the real pivots upon which the whole question must turn. These are, in our opinion, the comparative efficacy of the two systems in their application to this country; the probable balance of evil, as well as good, which will be attached to them; the difference in their capacity of adjustment to the mass of existing institutions; the fact that the one is *in esse* and the other *in posse*; and the prudence, or imprudence, of giving up actual in exchange for prospective, benefits.

We know well, however, that there are many empirics among us, who are so enamoured of the ingredients of some favourite draught, that they never think of taking into account the habits and constitution of the intended recipient. They resemble Dr. Morison, the Hygeist, or some other member of the honourable fraternity, who comes among us with his “Universal Pills,” adapted to every case, surgical or medical—a remedy for every distemper, chronic or acute—an infallible specific for every malady of man, woman or child, of every size, sort and description whatsoever.

But since the charlatans of political philosophy are not satisfied to reach the end of their journey with speed and comfort, unless they can make the shape of their conveyance according to the last Parisian taste, and would therefore build a vehicle upon a new model, and propel it by the steam of legislative interference,—let them only take care lest the whole ancient machine of English policy should be blown up with one mighty explosion.

We must here bring our present observations to a close; yet we have only been enabled to embrace one part out of many in a subject of vast complication as well as extent. We hope to travel through the whole by degrees, and for that purpose wish to take one thing at a time. Of the great questions respecting popular education, the first is, “Whether the country ought to be educated?” This, as we began by stating, we consider carried by acclamation. The second is, “How, and by whom, is the country to be educated?” This we have now discussed; yet the discussion has been partial after all, since we have done little more than endeavoured to establish the negative proposition, that it is *not* to be educated by the state. The third is, “Up to what point, in what branches of knowledge, by what processes of tuition, is the

poor population to be educated?" This we must altogether reserve; and it branches out into so many ramifications, that we shall probably recur to it again and again. Here too we have only examined the question of individuals and associations *versus* the state: the question, as it regards the comparative merits of various societies *inter se*, with their respective powers and methods of instruction, we may treat at some future opportunity; unless the state, by swallowing them all up in its more capacious jaws, should prevent the opportunity from occurring.

Against the existence of the British and Foreign Society, no objection is levelled. Let it exist; let it do its utmost in a fair spirit of emulation; but let it not be exalted to the permanent eminence of a government scheme upon the discountenance, if not the ruin, of its rival connected with the Church.

One word only as to the sentiments of ministers, and the new system of centralisation, and we have done. The intentions of the government ought, as soon as possible, to be declared. The uncertainty is injurious, as well as painful: for we happen to know, that upon the principle of the existing system there are many projects of amelioration in the details, many schemes to extend the sphere of tuition, or improve and facilitate its processes. If the state is to disjoint and break up the whole machine, they will come to nothing: nor is it to be supposed that much can be undertaken while the question remains in this unsettled state.

Lord Brougham said, in his last speech upon the subject,—

"In order to satisfy his mind upon this point, he addressed in his individual capacity about 500 letters to clergymen in every county in the kingdom, requesting information on the subject of the schools in their respective parishes. To these letters, which were addressed quite at random, he received nearly as many answers, and the information which they contained was highly gratifying. The result showed that whereas in 1818 there were in the whole kingdom, as he had already stated, 14,000 unendowed day schools educating 478,000 children, in 1828 there were in the particular places to which he had addressed his letters alone no less than 3,200 schools of this description, educating 105,000 children. Taking these places as affording a fair sample of the rest of the kingdom, as he had a right to do from the manner in which he had addressed his circulars, the result would be, that there were 230,000 unendowed day schools, educating 1,030,000 children, all supported by voluntary subscriptions, independently of the endowed schools, which educated 165,000, and of the Sunday schools, which furnished very useful and salutary education, though necessarily of inferior importance to that which could be obtained from day schools. Under these circumstances, he became a convert to the opinion of those who thought it would be unwise to disturb a state of things which pro-



duced such admirable results ; and therefore he abandoned his plan for establishing a compulsory rate for the purposes of education."—*Times*.

This statement is satisfactory in every point of view. But we have lately heard other expectations expressed : we have seen *feelers* put forth in the public journals ; and questions of a rather equivocal tendency have been sent round. Yet, if they are fairly answered, and the answers are well weighed, we have no fear as to the results.

Is any indication, we ask, to be drawn from the conclusion of the Poor Law Commissioners' Report ?

" One great advantage of any measure which shall remove or diminish the evils of the present system, is, that it will in the same degree remove the obstacles which now impede the progress of instruction, and intercept its results ; and will afford a freer scope to the operation of every instrument which may be employed for elevating the intellectual and moral condition of the poorer classes. We believe, that if the funds now *destined to the purposes of education, many of which are applied in a manner unsuited to the present wants of society, were wisely and economically employed*, they would be sufficient to give all the assistance which can be prudently afforded by the state. As the subject is not within our commission, we will not dwell on it further, and we have ventured on these few remarks only for the purpose of recording our conviction, that as soon as a good administration of the poor laws shall have rendered further improvement possible, the most important duty of *the legislature* is to take measures to promote the religious and moral education of the labouring classes."—p. 362.

Now the connection between the question of state education and the question of the poor laws, is quite undeniable. There are many and many ligaments which bind them together. On the one hand, in proportion as the poor of a country are well trained in moral and religious instruction, idle and reckless and reprobate poverty is likely to decline. The child whose intellect has been at all expanded, and much more whose heart has been imbued with virtuous habits, will probably, in after-life, have an abhorrence of mere *pauperism*, as a degradation and a stain ; while the worst and most frequent *causes* of pauperism, intemperance and sloth, will perhaps gradually disappear. On the other hand, the reaction of benefit may be almost equal. If there be a good system of poor laws well administered, a vast advantage may flow to the cause of education, both in a pecuniary and practical point of view. The parents, improved in their feelings and conduct, will be more anxious, it may be hoped, to send their children to a school, and more willing, as well as more able, to pay something towards the expense of maintaining it ; and the richer inhabitants of a parish, when they shall be less burdened with

poor rates, will be happy, we should think, to contribute more to the purposes of education. We are at least certain, that the money which may thus be saved, can never be put out to a better and more Christian use.

At the same time, it does appear to us, that the sentences which we have quoted are loose and ambiguous, and therefore to be deplored as occurring in a very laborious and able report, which has the sanction of two prelates, who—we speak in the most respectful sincerity—would, we are sure, rather cut off their right hands, than sign a document which contained one word tending to the injury of the Established Church.

One recommendation of these Commissioners is, the establishment of a *Central* Board for the better administration of the poor laws. Other schemes are, we believe, in agitation, to be worked either in connection with this identical board, or on a similar principle. On this topic, then, we shall dwell for one moment, and conclude.

Among the new questions which have grown up with the progress of circumstances, is the question of *centralization*. It will, after all, perhaps, be a question of *degree*, because there must always be *some* general regulation, as long as there is a general legislature; and some *local* regulation, into whatever sections a country is distributed. But without entering into this question at large—a question, however, which we feel to be, under many points of view, as important as it is wide—we would here state one reason, why we should regret to see a new division of the country, with reference to the instruction of the poor. One of the oldest, nay, we believe the very oldest and strongest link (formal and arbitrary as some may foolishly imagine it) which connects the clergy with all classes and conditions of the laity, is the division of the country into parishes or parochial districts. Change this parochial into a departmental, or any other division, and the link is broken; and the *great* object of the movement party may be attained under the pretence of merely making a territorial arrangement more accurate and scientific. The division into parishes is not only an ancient division of the land, but a Christian division, because it entwines Christianity and its ministers with the habits and the education, and the social economy of the kingdom.

The matter is too important, too serious, too urgent, for any false and shrinking delicacy. There is no safety for the country if men are afraid of telling unpalatable truths; or if the edge of their thoughts is dulled and blunted by the fear of giving offence. A good cause must do itself justice; or its intrinsic character will not avail it. It will not be sufficiently appreciated: for it will not be adequately known. The last few years are pregnant

with examples. As a body, the old Tory party opposed only a passive kind of resistance, or heavy sluggish inertness against active and unremitted assaults: they suffered their adversaries to gain an almost entire possession of the press, to win the ear and heart of the people, simply by their superior energy, and the fact of telling the same story until the public mind could receive no other:—and where are they? The high-church party, again, has been slothful and secure: it has been wanting, as a whole, to the proper assertion of its own principles—and what is the consequence?—How is it beset and endangered from within and from without! And so it will always be. And although a genuine, sterling, Christianity contains within itself a vital and indestructible power, we tempt God unless we use all human means within our grasp for its preservation, and for its advancement. The conservative system is right in the main. But the conservative system must be enlarged, must be enlightened, must be stimulated into a quicker, and bolder, and wider course. New health, new vigour must be infused: and the blood must flow with a more rapid current in its veins. The defence must be proportioned to the attack. The efforts on the one side must be on a commensurate scale with the efforts on the other. If they be *not*, the next ten years will laugh at the comparatively minute and trifling changes which the last ten have produced. The preparations of a party, hostile to existing institutions from their theoretical principles, as from their practical interests, were never so vast, or so well organized. Their engines are not simply, as of old, a few debaters in parliament, and a few writers in the public journals and reviews; but they are multiplied and ramified, as we have shown, to an almost incredible extent. We shall not malign their motives; they may think that revolution is a good; but we do say, that their object is revolution—a revolution in the church—which will bring its very existence into jeopardy: a revolution in the state, which will alter almost all its forms, and almost all its establishments: a revolution in the local arrangements and social usages of the land. The scheme of state education, if the utmost caution be not used, will be made subservient to this design. Let it be our care that the instruction of the country be never rent asunder from the faith of the country: and may God forbid, that we should see the awful spectacle in England during the nineteenth century which was exhibited in France during the eighteenth, of philosophy, and literature, and science, and education arrayed against religion. We hope to preserve all: and, for the sake of all, we would cling most to that which is best. If things are brought to the issue of a decisive struggle, let us enter the contest with a humble, but resolute, firmness; and let there be inscribed upon our banner the one watchword, “Christianity.”

## ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

IN attempting, with our contracted space, a critical digest of such events and such publications of the last quarter as have a more especial bearing upon the religion of the country, we feel quite as sensibly as any of our readers can feel, that our summary of occurrences must be hurried and imperfect, and our commentary upon the theological literature of the season, which happens to be, on the whole, of peculiar value, must be slight and inadequate to its merits. But we have not even room to offer any excuse for our deficiencies; for the greater the magnitude of our task, the less can we afford to make a preface.

In future, we may hope to find room for a careful review of a larger number of books, and for a more detailed survey of Ecclesiastical Affairs; but we can scarcely now regret the large space which we have devoted to the subject of Education, because the most important of all objects is to provide that the education of a country shall not be torn apart from its religion; or the superintendence of that education taken out of the hands of the Clergy belonging to its Established Church. Nor shall we scruple to add, that there are some other subjects, of almost equal importance, upon which there prevail delusions of almost equal magnitude, and on which we are determined to speak with the same freedom, although, we trust, not at the same length.

Another reason, however, for not entering into much discussion is, that His Majesty's Ministers have allowed us no opportunity. The Easter Recess has begun, and no one measure relating to the Church has been brought to a final stage. Lord John Russell's Marriage Bill has proved as miserable an abortion as ever was still-born. In all human probability, we shall hear no more of the bantling; unless, to use the Irish metaphor, the child shall during the holidays be changed at nurse.

Nothing else has yet appeared in a substantive shape. Events are coming, but their shadows only are cast before them. We hear of a Bill for the Commutation of Tithes; but as to its enactments we are left in darkness. We hear of a Bill for a Commutation of Church Rates; but as to its precise character we are left in darkness. We hear of some general measure for a civil Registration of births, deaths, and marriages; but as to its mode or instruments of execution we are left in darkness. Unfortunately, too, this is not merely a darkness which may be felt, but which may be felt with very uncomfortable sensations of misgiving and doubt.

Under these circumstances, seeing nothing in the shape of specific legislation with which we can deal, we shall merely offer a few remarks upon the progress of affairs and the state of opinions. And first we would speak of

THE GENERAL POSITION OF THE CHURCH SINCE THE BEGINNING  
OF THE YEAR 1834.

UPON the whole, the state of things seems more encouraging than at the close of the last year. We cannot but attribute the change in some degree to a course of conduct which we have ourselves, among other more powerful organs of opinion, been humble instruments in recommending. The friends and ministers of the Church have shown *boldness* without *violence*. They have neither meanly succumbed nor plunged about in furious animosity or headlong despair. They have manifested a determination, not so much to stand up for their own rights and temporalities, as calmly and firmly to fight the battle of the national religion; and the very demonstration has had its effect. Again, the clergy have appealed to the laity, and the laity, in their turn, have come forward to display their attachment and reverence for the Church.

Among the particular occurrences which have taken place, we might mention the presentation of the Address, on many accounts memorable, to the Archbishop of Canterbury, with the mild, and temperate, and judicious Reply, so characteristic of his Grace. We might mention the Declaration of the laity, which is in the course of signature, and which has already been most numerously signed. We might mention the meetings at Cheltenham, Nottingham, Liverpool, Plymouth, Norwich, and many other places; the proceedings at Coventry and Durham; the local addresses, full of affectionate respect, to particular prelates; and the Declaration signed at Liverpool among the members of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland. Here, indeed, there might be a fellow feeling; for the Church of Scotland, which has no golden stalls, no rich pluralities, is as vehemently attacked as the Church of England, which is so stigmatized as having both.

On the other side, there is a vast deal of enmity to be met, if it cannot be conquered; and of danger to be faced, if it cannot be surmounted or turned aside. The tactics of the Dissenters are altered; but we verily believe, that their views and intentions are the same as before. A redress of particular grievances has been put forward more than an absolute separation between Church and State. To this course they have been recommended by his Majesty's ministers, and more especially by Lord Grey. For our own parts, we have thought and think, that the *wishes* of the administration—at least, of its most able and estimable members—are not hostile to the Church; but we do exceedingly fear, that ministers are *not masters of their own purposes*, and that they will be driven or entrapped into the madness of admitting principles, and then shrinking from the legitimate consequences which inevitably follow their admission.

Among the Dissenters themselves, a squall of disagreement appears to have sprung up. Some would keep back, or conceal, or even forego, a part of their demands; others would make them all, and enforce them all, openly, and at once. Our belief is, that almost every Dissenter stultifies and condemns himself, unless hatred of the principle of an Ecclesiastical Establishment is the root or

fountain of his opposition; therefore, we repeat, the downfall of the Church, as connected with the State, is the ultimate end and aim which all Dissenters have in view; and sooner or later even the Wesleyans must actively co-operate in its promotion, or throw themselves fairly and frankly back upon the bosom of the Establishment. No middle course will long be found tenable, or consistent with itself; and unless legislators and writers look with a steady eye to these considerations, and are cautious how they make immediate concessions, the Church cannot be preserved. Our maxim in this, as in other cases, ought to be to improve details, but to guard principles intact and inviolable.

Let us adapt these remarks to the matters in which the Legislature has expressed its intention to interfere, but with a merely general application, because in ignorance of the exact plans to be proposed. We take, then,

#### THE QUESTION OF CIVIL REGISTRATION.

It cannot, we think, be denied, that a Civil Registration, accurately and comprehensively made, must have its advantages. It has advantages in a statistical—advantages in a legal—advantages in a medical—advantages in a scientific point of view:—and yet it would be unwise to commit ourselves, beforehand, to an approbation of the scheme; while, as yet, we cannot compare the benefits with the mischiefs which may attend it—while, as yet, we cannot examine its practicability, or its compatibility with the integrity of the Church, and the influence of the clergy in their respective parishes. A strong light, we doubt not, will soon be thrown over the subject by some other publications as well as by the remarks of Sir Edward Sugden. Upon the lengthy “*Report*” we quite decline to expatiate.

We take, again, the question of

#### THE ADMISSION OF DISSENTERS TO DEGREES AT OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE.

“A discussion,” says the Times of March 22, “of more than common interest took place last night in the House of Lords, on a petition from sixty-three resident members of the University of Cambridge, recommending to their Lordships ‘the expediency of abrogating by legislative enactment every religious test exacted from members of the University before they proceed to degrees, whether of bachelor, master, or doctor, in arts, law, and physic.’” The petition has been much vaunted, on account of the value of the signatures. Many of the names stand high, as the names of scholars or men of science; but as the names of men who are practical politicians, or well acquainted with the details of the empire, and the thousand causes of disturbance which are at work, they are not to be mentioned. The *prima facie* case, we admit, is in favour of the admission, on the ground of liberality, if not of justice. Yet Mr. Goulburn might be quite right when he stated broadly that the proposed admission to degrees at Cambridge would change the whole character of the University, from being “an institution formed exclusively for the maintenance of the Established Church, to



that of an establishment for the general education of the country, without reference to religion."

Sir R. Peel's admirable speech on Wednesday, March 26, ought to decide the question as to granting a supposed boon, where the "first concession would involve the remainder;" and we do trust, that the due and all-important distinction will be drawn between the removal of "*civil disabilities*" and the granting of privileges which confer *religious* power. We merely mean to state, that the question must be viewed with reference to the general preservation of the Establishment, if the Establishment is to be preserved.

At Oxford, in conformity with the sentiments expressed in Parliament by the new Chancellor, his Grace the Duke of Wellington, the opposition to the admittance of Dissenters to degrees seems almost unanimous.

"Superior and alone Confucius stood,"

in the shape of Mr. Professor Powell.

We might take, again,

#### THE QUESTION OF THE EXCLUSION OF THE BISHOPS FROM THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

But here, at least, the ministers seem disposed *for the present* to stand firm. In fact, they must feel that, if the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London are dismissed, the Duke of Devonshire and Lord Grey will not sit in much security. When the peer spiritual goes out, the peer temporal will follow, nearly as fast as the sparks in a piece of burnt paper, when the children say, "There goes the *parson*, and there goes the clerk."

The *Lord Chancellor*, at least, will hardly disavow the sentiments subjoined: "For the Church of England we cherish the utmost respect. We not only grudge her none of those rights wherewithal she is plentifully endowed—not only wish to see her safe from all disputes as to her title—all attempts to lay her low; but we go farther—and would *have her dignities and her honours secure*. 'We will have her to exalt her mitred front in Courts and Parliaments;' and will view AN ENEMY TO THE STATE in every one, who, either by open assault, or by secret treachery, or by the still more dangerous enmity of injudicious and disreputable friendship, would bring *her rights or her power* either into jeopardy or suspicion."

We take then the most contested

#### QUESTION OF CHURCH RATES:

The difficulty is quite obvious. The principle of a Church Establishment, like every other general provision which ever has been or ever will be made for the regulation of mankind, carries along with it, we confess, certain inconveniences, and, it may be, certain hardships in its application to particular cases. But we can neither consent nor afford to give up the principle on account of the individual hardship; or, in reality, we could leave no tax, no rate, and perhaps no single enactment, untouched upon the Statute Book. The principle of a

Church Establishment does involve the principle, that all the inhabitants of a country shall *bear a part of the expense* of a State Religion, whether they attach themselves to its communion or not. The Church-rates are an adaptation of this principle to a special exigency; they stand upon the same foundation with the whole structure of a Church Establishment, and the danger is, that they may pull down the whole structure in their downfall. The present state of things is not agreeable; but we can conceive many remedies far more grievous than the disease.

Nor can we here deny ourselves just a few words upon the broad principle of the Church. We assume, that a National Church is instituted for the good of all the nation: and that all the inhabitants of a country do actually derive a specific benefit from an established religion, as much as an established government. We affirm that a sound and scriptural Religion, standing between profaneness and fanaticism, upholding the State, and upheld by the State in turn, does *more* for the peace, the good order, the public and private virtue, the public and private happiness of an empire, than all its civil enactments and all its municipal police. Hence it is inferred, that the liability to contribute to the support of the Church becomes an universal liability, upon precisely the same principle as the liability to contribute to the support of the State: therefore, that the Dissenter, or the Infidel, who enjoys in many ways a direct and indirect advantage from the Ecclesiastical Establishment, may be, with both a legal and moral equity, taxed for its maintenance; as a man who is a Republican at heart may be taxed for the maintenance of a Monarchical Government, while he lives under its protection; in short, that the individual hardship, if it exists, must bend to the public welfare; and that the general arrangements of an empire cannot be regulated by individual opinions, nor vary with them; and that exemptions cannot be made, in compliance with caprice, or as a premium to irreligion.

This is the broad principle, designedly put in its unqualified and least attractive shape. But still if ministers concede this principle, they will, and they must be driven, inch by inch, from every one of the details which they may be anxious to preserve.

We throw out these hints because we see the strangest inconsistencies and paralogisms prevalent upon the subject. Men talk of being "honestly attached to the doctrines and discipline of the Church of England," and yet assist in the assault upon it, as an Establishment connected with the State. They would support the Church, and yet throw down the outworks by which it must be fenced. They would guard the citadel, and yet level the bastions which protect it, and fill the ditch before it with the fragments.

In the same way, we would speak of the great and general question of redressing

#### THE GRIEVANCES OF THE DISSENTERS.

Redress the grievances of the Dissenters! Alas! the Establishment is itself the grievance! This then is a case in which, from the very nature of the difficulty, half measures must be unsuccessful and unsatisfactory. Our object must be how to make the Establishment most efficacious and most beneficial in itself;

not how to make it palatable to the Dissenters. We might as well entertain the problem how to make Protestantism palatable to Roman Catholics, or the principle of an hereditary Monarchy palatable to a Republican. We only lose our time, and waste our exertions, until we come to the broad statement, that, as far as the Dissenters are concerned, there is no alternative between a total abandonment, or an integral preservation. No modifications or concessions can reconcile two principles which are contradictory in their very essence. Be it always observed, that we speak of *religious*, and not *civil* matters.

Cases may be indeed easily conceived in which it is wise and salutary to give up a part for the sake of preserving the rest. But an Ecclesiastical Establishment belongs not to this category. It must be dominant, or it is nothing. It must possess exclusive privileges, or it is nothing. It exists, we repeat, for the benefit of all; and therefore has a just title to make all contribute to its support. These are its intrinsic and fundamental qualities: this is the atmosphere in which it lives, and it will live in no other. Unless we are prepared to maintain these propositions, we cannot maintain an Established Church. We must exercise all kindness and charity in our intercourse with the Dissenters, as man with man and Christian with Christian; but remembering that the question of a Church Establishment is a question partly religious and partly civil, we cannot surrender to them one jot of religious truth, or even of political principle.

It must be admitted, that the Church Establishment in England, or any church establishment actual or imaginable, is not more than any other institution of human origin, an *unmixed* good; but if good preponderates in the balance, then in the name of reason, let us look fairly and firmly at the whole together, and repudiate the wretched weakness of not defending the difficulties, which are inseparable from the preservation of the advantages. Either let us give up all, or let us keep those parts, which, although of an awkward or offensive aspect, when considered by themselves, are absolutely necessary for the efficiency of the rest.

To us it appears, that the *leading fallacy* of the times is an attempt to disjoin things which are indissolubly connected, and to amalgamate things which can never be harmonized. This is, perhaps, exactly the mistake into which an intellectual and theoretical age is likely to fall. This is exactly the fallacy which is likely to seduce the scholars, the scientific men, the liberal cosmopolites, and the philosophical politicians of a country. The facilities and varieties of intercourse which now exist between this empire, and not merely the other nations of Europe, but all parts of the globe, and the reciprocal knowledge which their inhabitants possess more and more of the language of each other, favour this species of continentalism or cosmopolitism. Men see in their own institutions something, which is at first sight a blemish or a grievance: they see in the institutions abroad something which appears a beauty and an excellence. The remedy seems easy: remove the one, and place the other in its stead. Men forget the want of affinity, and the difference of the fundamental principle. They forget, on the one side, how the whole may be shattered as the parts are detached; they forget, on the other side, that neither in physical nor moral chemistry is there an antecedent security, that because two ingredi-

ents are separately good, there will be same quality of goodness in their compound.

With this fallacy, however, we have dealt at large in our remarks upon education; we shall here take leave to refer to them, in the assurance that they are applicable, at least in their spirit, to many other practical and most important subjects, because these subjects also are perverted and mystified by the intrusion of the same error.

We know not whether the aggregate of operations, which are now going forward, is the result of several independent and accidental agencies, or regular and systematic plans. We are told, however, that "a certain party in the country a party who would think it an imputation upon their philosophy to be considered as favourable to a religious establishment, would first obtain possession of the *general government* of the country, and would then seize the *local* administration by means of central boards—by commissions—by civil *registration* in the hands of a *civil officer*:—the *literature* of the country by such societies as the Society for Promoting Useful Knowledge:—the science and philosophy of the country, by associations widely diffused:—the religion (what is to be left of it) of the country, by promoting and patronizing rationalists and semi-infidels:—the instruction of the people, by a General State Education:—the education of the higher ranks, by the same scheme, and also by chartering new Universities, and opening the old to Dissenters; and would thus consolidate, and universalize, and perpetuate their system and their power." Is this representation right or wrong? We merely give it, as we hear it.

Our opinion assuredly is, that if government, the most practical of all sciences, is to be regulated by paper-schemes and abstract speculations; if measures are to be precipitated, for which the habits of the people are not suited, and the temper of the people is not prepared, we may give up a vast portion of those peculiar advantages so long enjoyed under forms and institutions, which, if not adjusted with a scientific and metaphysical precision, at least fit into each other, and work together to our solid and lasting good; while we shall continentalize our system, without introducing a new harmony of beneficial results, because our old usages and our insular freedoms will rush in to disturb and mar for ever the regular action of the mighty engine.

Having said so much on general points, we must pass without notice the very important proceedings of Christian, and Educational, and Benevolent Societies; but here we have the less compunction, as we hope hereafter to go through a regular survey of their objects, their transactions, their state and prospects, beginning with the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge.

A new Association, we may remark, has been formed in London, intituled, "The Statistical Society." We hail its establishment with much satisfaction; and we are sure that it has been long wanted, and that it may do a vast quantity of good, *provided always that it adheres to the collection and classification of Facts, and does not mix itself up with political opinions.* How M. Quételet should have managed to have obtained the credit of its institution we cannot conceive, as the thing has been proposed and recommended over and over again, long before he came to pay a visit to the British Association.

We trust that the Society will, among their first efforts, endeavour to ascertain and settle on unimpeachable grounds the relative numbers of Churchmen and Dissenters throughout England and Wales.

We must also forbear from saying more upon the internal state of the Church. In some respects a melancholy picture might be drawn, from the manifestations of the Spirit in the pulpit, to the unhappy squabbles in the vestry-room. For ourselves, our stand must be taken between the pliant and accommodative neology, which would plane down all spiritual things and all revealed marvels to the smooth level of a rational morality, and the wild extravagance which is made the bye-word of the infidel, and more, perhaps, than all other causes put together, steels him against conviction. On the one hand, if we give up the difficulties and mysteries of religion, we must give up religion itself; on the other, the sure way to make the reason of a country irreligious, is to make the religion of a country unreasonable.

For the rest we can only devote a very few words to

#### 1. THE GENERAL CHARACTER OF THE THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE OF THE SEASON.

Here there is abundant room for congratulation and honest triumph. How many and how dignified writers have entered the field. In the list are Archbishop Whateley with his *Second Letter on Transportation*; the Bishops of London, of Gloucester, of Llandaff, to say nothing of "*Philalethes Cantabrigiensis*," whose work is of sterling excellence, be the writer who he may. We then come to the first-rate volumes of Dr. Shuttleworth and Mr. Le Bas, of which we hope to speak in our next Number; as also of M. Tyler's useful and well-timed publication upon Oaths; then again to the smaller contributions of Mr. Benson, Dr. D'Oyley, Professor Sedgwick, and a multitude of others; and we ask, with a proud confidence, what other body of Churchmen in the world displays upon the whole so much of profound, and varied, and active talent? What have the Dissenters to put into competition with the present more than the past efforts of the Church?

Separate works we can now merely class under their respective heads.

#### SYSTEMS OF THEOLOGY.

Under this division we have "*The Christian Theology of Benedict Pictet*," translated from the Latin by Frederic Reyroux, B.A. and forming a part of "*The Christian's Family Library*;" and the *Elementary Lectures* of Mr. Conybeare. John Murray. 1834.

As to the former work, we are glad to find a general confirmation of Church doctrines and principles by a Foreign Professor, long celebrated for deep learning and orthodox piety. As to the latter, it contains many sensible observations in language well adapted to the subject-matter.

#### VOLUMES OF SERMONS.

Among these we have read with peculiar pleasure the nervous *Discourses* of Mr. King, of Sculcoates; some of Mr. Hampden's; Mr. Newman's excellent

and practical "Parochial Discourses;" Mr. Coxe's Practical Sermons; and Mr. Mountain's Twelve Sermons on Advent.

**"LIBRARIES," CONNECTED WITH RELIGION AND MORALITY.**

IN the Theological Library is another volume of *Mr. Smedley's History of France*. As we may, perhaps, criticise it hereafter, we shall here only express our admiration of the sound views which it contains, the ability with which it is written, and the unflagging interest with which it carries forward the reader.

We have also

**"PERSIA," FROM THE EDINBURGH CABINET LIBRARY.**

THIS is a volume in a covering peculiarly neat, containing 472 pages, beautifully printed, with an excellent map and thirteen picturesque and well-executed engravings, for the price of five shillings. This seems really wonderful, even in these days of cheap publication. The history itself is interesting and fairly written; although, in point of style, we do not think it equal to Mr. Crichton's work upon Arabia. Having, perhaps, spoken rather harshly—though not, we think, unjustly—of some features in that work, we now offer our tribute of the sincerest commendation to the general value of the Edinburgh Library, and the admirable skill and spirit, with which it is conducted, and which place it at least on a par with any other series of the kind.

**CONTROVERSIAL TRACTS AND DISCOURSES.**

OF these, as might be expected, there has been a most abundant supply; but among them *only one* from Lord Henley, and *only one* from Dr. Burton. In defence of the Establishment have stepped forward, besides the Bishop of London and Mr. Benson, Mr. Walter Hook and Mr. Harness, whose sermons are well entitled to attention: and many other persons are taking up the cause from the pulpit,—sometimes, we are free to say, in a manner not the most salutary or judicious. There is also before us a large *assortment* of books from Ireland, from America, and from the Continent,—to which we are most anxious to do justice when we have room.

**RELIGIOUS AND MORAL POETRY.**

UNDER this head we have "*Church Reform*," a satire, which costs little; and is, perhaps, not worth much more than it costs: cantos one and two of the *Wonders of Chaos and Creation exemplified*, in blank verse, a poem which seems itself rather a chaotic affair; and the "*Lay of Life*," by Hans Busk, of which we are told in an advertisement, "*this highly finished, interesting, and moral work will be often perused by those who have once read it.*" We really cannot say, having found it impossible to get over the first difficulty.

**ILLUSTRATIVE WORKS CONNECTED WITH RELIGION.**

IT would be unjust not to reserve one line for mentioning the splendidly elaborated Chart by Mr. Mimpriss, a work of vast, and, we hope, well repaid, toil; and the first part of *Landscape Illustrations of the Bible*—a beautiful publication.



# INDEX

OF THE

## REMARKABLE PASSAGES

IN THE

### CRITICISMS, EXTRACTS, AND ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.



#### A.

- Abbot* (Archbishop), difference between, and Laud, on ecclesiastical polity, 71, 72.
- Aikin* (Miss), remarks on her severity against Henriette, queen of Charles I., 77—on her misrepresentation of Laud's discussion at Oxford, 78—and on her hostility to Charles I., 81—85—her erroneous assertion respecting the authorship of the Icon Basilike, 82—abstract of her account of the murder of the king, 82—84.
- Alcuin*, account of the life and writings of, 135—137—pretended account of the Book of Jasher attributed to him, 132—135—anachronisms detected in it, 139—Alcuin not the author of that production, but Jacob Ilive, 139—142.
- Alliance* between Church and State, observations of a Dissenter on, 179, 180—and on its dissolution, 187—remarks thereon, 188, 189.
- Allowance* (Pecuniary), to paupers, evils of granting, and frauds practised to obtain it, exposed, 211—214.
- American Episcopal Church*, historical account of the rise and progress of, 285—295—opinions of Americans on Church Establishments, 312, 313.
- Anderson* (Rev. Robert), character of his exposition of Saint Paul's Epistle to the Romans, 96—abstract of his exposition of the eighth chapter, 89—91—remarks on his interpretation of part of the fourth chapter, 91, 92.
- Antoninus* (Marcus), reflections on the character and principles of the persecution of the Christians by, 14—16.
- Arians*, intolerance of, 20.
- Arius*, character of, 21.
- Athanasius*, character of, 21, 22.

VOL. XV.

#### B.

- Bastardy Laws*, observations on the effects of, 222.
- Binney* (T.), extracts from his address on laying the foundation stone of a new meeting-house, on the alliance of Church and State, 179, 180—on the differences of opinion existing between clergymen, 181, 182—on compulsory payments to a church, 182, 183—his scheme of comprehension of all Dissenters, 183—charges the National Church with destroying more souls than it saves, 185—his sentiments on the dissolution of Church and State, 187—remarks on it, 188, 189.
- Bishops*, on the exclusion of, from the House of Lords, 497.
- Bland* (Mrs. E.), on the interpretation of Psalm xc., 10, 407, 408.
- Bond* (Mr. C. R.), the editor of the spurious Book of Jasher, anecdotes of, 130—extracts from his prospectus of a new edition of it, 129—131—proofs that his advertisement is founded on that of Jacob Ilive, 141—remarks on it, 142.
- Boniface VIII.* (Pope), miserable death of, 29.
- Botolph's* (St.) parish, meeting against tithes and church rates, account of, 190—remarks on it, 191.
- Butler's* (Bishop), mode of treating the subject of morals, vindicated from the strictures of Dr. Wardlaw, 327—331.

#### C.

- Cabinet Libraries*, objections to the present system of, 97—99.
- Chandler* (Rev. Dr.), anecdotes and character of, 293, 294.

L. L.

*Chapels* (Proprietary), remarks on, 193, 194.

*Charles I.*, state of England at the accession of, 51—53—his birth and education, 55—57—created prince of Wales, 58—his encouragement of learning, 58, 59—remarks on his character, 60—consequences of his marriage with Henrietta of France, 61—his reception of her, 63—unjustly charged with introducing popery, 63, 64—restores part of the property which had been taken from the church in Scotland, 64—hostility of the great barons in consequence, *ibid.*—efforts of the Scottish covenanters to produce disaffection, 65—their negotiations against the king with foreign allies, *ibid.*—particularly with France, 66—pretended loyalty of the Scotch to Charles, 67—fatal consequences of the advice given by his councillors, 68 his attempt to seize the five arraigned members, *ibid.* 69—remarks on the state of parties, 69, 70—the loyalty of the Romanists checked by the pope's interference, 70—the royal cause artfully identified by demagogues with Arminianism and Popery, 73—difficulty of his situation between them and the Scottish covenanters, 74—illiberal spirit predominant among Christians of all denominations, 75—speech against the royal measures by Sir John Eliot, 76—failure of Charles in settling the affairs of the Scottish Church, 78—80 account of his murder, 82—84—his remains interred at Windsor, 84.

*Christianity*, superiority of, over Mohammedism, 111—116.

*Christians*, persecution of, by the emperors, Marcus Antoninus, 14—16—and Diocletian, 16—reflections on the propagation of Christianity, 22, 23.

*Church of England*, suggestion for improving the psalmody of, 161—opinions of a Dissenter on the alliance between Church and State, 179, 180—and on the dissolution of that alliance, 187—remarks on it, 188, 189—on compulsory payments in support of a church, 182, 183—the Church of England charged with the destruction of souls, 185—the duty of churchmen in the present crisis, 189—account of the meeting in the parish of St. Botolph, Bishopsgate, against tithes and church rates, 190—remarks on it, 191—unjust censures of the clergy of, 273—remarks thereon, 274—277—on the evils of party distinctions in the church,

277—280—general position of the church since the commencement of the year 1834, 495, 496.

*Church Establishments*, American opinions on, 312, 313.

*Church Rates*, observations on, 497, 498.

*Clement* (St.), testimony of, in favour of the existence of bishops, 7—9.

*Collects* of the Church of England, antiquity of, 26.

*Common Prayer Book*, the use of, not necessarily productive of formality, 403, 404.

*Corinth*, discussion of the question whether there were bishops of, before the year 65, 5—9.

*Crichton* (Andrew), character of his History of Arabia, 99—101—passages from it contrasted with extracts from Gibbon, proving his plagiarisms, 102—108—observations on them, 109, 110.

## D.

*Deluge*, Mr. Lyell's geological view of, 360—362—strictures on it, 362.

*Diocletian's* persecution of the Christians, notice of, 16.

*Dissenters*, on the admission of, to degrees, at Oxford and Cambridge, 496, 497—observations on the redressing of their alleged grievances, 498—500.

## E.

*Earth*, causes of the changes in the surface of, 351—352.

*Ecclesiastical Record*, 227—240, 496—502.

*Education*, what elements of, should be given to the children of the poor, 436 conflicting opinions on the propriety of a state education, 437, 438—efforts made for promoting national education, 439—evidence on the importance of its being connected with the church establishment, 439, 440—suggestion of a committee of the House of Commons on this subject, 440, 441—recommendations of state education by some modern liberals, 441, 442—review of the argument from authority or precedent, or from the example of other nations, which is shown not to be applicable to England, 444—particularly the appeal to antiquity, 445—to Scotland, 446—to Ireland and the West Indies, 447—to France and Germany, 448—and to Prussia, 449, 450—and the dukedom of Nassau, 451—the cases of Prussia

and France not applicable to England, 445, 456—examination of the advantages claimed for state education over the exertions of societies and individuals, 457—tremendous insecurity of education by the state, 458, 459—examination of the argument from necessity, 459—461—statement of the good now actually in progress by means of individual and voluntary exertion, 461, 462—misrepresentation in the *Edinburgh Review* of the labours of the National Society, exposed, 463—470—Mr. Bulwer's assertion refuted, 467—the proposed system of national education a perilous one, on account of the expense, 473—475—the difficulty of providing adequate superintendence, 475, 476—impracticability of compulsory attendance, 476—and as to what is to be taught, 479—how far religious instruction is to extend, *ibid.*—impossibility of blending discordant elements into one system, 480—impossibility of Church and State acting together, 481—484—the proposed scheme of subversion of the Established Church, and to disconnect divine from human knowledge, 484, 485—the proposed plan unnecessary and dangerous, 486—488—the adequacy of the number of existing schools and the quantum of instruction now given to each child, considered, 488—returns of the numbers of children educated, reported by Lord Brougham, 492—connexion of state education and the poor laws, 493—examination of the recommendation of the commissioners on the poor laws, 494—danger of making the scheme of national education subservient to revolution, 495.

*Eloquence* of the pulpit, observations on, 205—207.

*England*, political state of, at the accession of Charles I., and the circumstances which led to it, 50—53.

*Episcopacy*, proof of the existence of, in the Apostolic age, 7—mistaken notions concerning, exposed, 9, 10.

*Europeans*, pestilent moral conduct of, a great obstacle to the propagation of Christianity in India, 381—383.

*Evelyn* (John), character and anecdotes of, 171, 172. 175—177.

## F.

*Family Libraries*, remarks on the present system of publishing, 97—99.

*Fanaticism* defused, 246, 247—is subversive of all moral principles, 248, 249—effect upon the fanatic of perpetually contemplating the more stern and awful attributes of the Deity, 250, 251—fanaticism of self-infliction, 252—260—of the brand, 260—266—of the banner, 266—268—of the symbol, 268—271.

*Formality* not necessarily produced by the use of the Book of Common Prayer, 403, 404.

*Formations*, table of recent and tertiary, 353.

## G.

*Gauden* (Dr.) not the author of the *Icon Basilike*, 82.

*Genesis*, literal interpretation of the first chapter of, vindicated, 359.

*Geology*, province of, 334, 335—sketch of the progress of, from its infancy to its recent revival, 326—331—discordance of the ancient and modern causes of changes in the earth's surface, 331—349—which are ascribed by Mr. Lyell to one uninterrupted succession of physical events governed by the laws now in operation, 350—352—table of recent and tertiary formations, 353—Mr. Lyell's scheme of geology inconsistent with the Scripture narrative, 356—362.

*George* of Cappadocia, character of, 20.

*Gibbon's* perfidious inconsistency exposed, 17.

*Gipps* (Rev. Henry), unjust censures of the clergy by him, 273.

*Gregory Nazianzen's* character of Athanasius, 21, 22.

*Gregory VII.* (Pope), ambition and character of, 27—causes of his success in usurping supreme power, 28—comparison of, with Innocent III., 30.

## H.

*Hammond* (Rev. Dr.), anecdotes of, with extracts from his correspondence, 165—169.

*Heaven*, Mohammed's pretended nocturnal journey to, described, 118—121.

*Henrietta* of France, advice given to, on her marriage with King Charles I., 61—63—description of her person, 63—anecdotes of her reception, *ibid.*—hostility of the Puritans to her, 76—unjustly charged with unfaithfulness to the king, 77.

*Henry* (Prince of Wales), anecdotes of, 56, 57.

*Hickeringill* (Rev. Edmund), autobiographical anecdotes of, 408—410.

*Hobart* (Bishop), notice of the ancestors of, 279, 280—anecdotes of his earlier years and education, 280—283—his early attachment to episcopacy, 284—is ordained by Bishop White, 285—state of the American Episcopal Church at this time, 285—295—character of Mr. Hobart's discourses, 295—his pastoral assiduity, 296—notice of his early publications, *ibid.*—especially of his *Companion to the Altar*, *ibid.*—endowment of his parish of Trinity Church, New York, 297—establishes the Protestant Episcopal Theological Society, 299—and the Churchman's Magazine, *ibid.*—elected Assistant Bishop of New York, *ibid.*—procures the foundation and endowment of the General Theological Seminary at New York, 300—his opinion on the importance of strictly maintaining the peculiar principles and doctrines of the Episcopal Church, 301, 302—his reasons for opposing the American Bible Society, 302—his departure for Europe for his health, 304—his vindication of the English character, 305—and description of English scenery, 305, 306—his reception on his return to America, 306—address to the Episcopal Convention of the diocese of New York, 307—his reasons for opposing private clerical associations, 308, 309—his lamented death, 310—successful results of the measures proposed by him for the welfare of the Protestant Episcopal Church, 310.

*Hone* (Rev. T. B.), observations of, on the character of Archbishop Usher, 162, 163—and on the communion of saints, 169.

*Horne's* (T. H.) proofs of contradictions of the Books of Moses and Joshua in the pretended Book of Jasher, 148, 149—his proofs that the Bristol edition of it is a reprint of Ilive's fabrication, 150—notice of an Apocryphal Book of Jasher in Rabbinical Hebrew, 150.

*Hutcheson's* Theory of the Moral Sense, observations on, 325, 326.

*Hutton's* Theory of Geology, notice of, 339, 340.

## I.

*Icon Basilike*, not the work of Bishop Gauden, 82.

*Ilive* (Jacob), the fabricator of the pretended Book of Jasher, biographical account of, 151—153.

*India*, the conduct of Europeans in, the grand obstacle to the progress of Christianity there, 381—383.

*Innocent III.* (Pope), character of, compared with that of Gregory VII., 50, 51.

*Inquisition* (Popish), cruelty of, 265, 266.

## J.

*James I.*, care of, in educating his children, 56, 57.

*Jasher* (Book of), allusions to, in Scripture, 127, 128—preface to a pretended Book of, 128—remarks on it, 129—prospectus for a new edition of it, put forth by Mr. C. R. Bond, 129—extracts from it, 131—account of it, pretended to be written by Alcuin, 132—135—Alcuin not the author of it, but Jacob Ilive, 140—142—specimen of the Book of the pseudo-Jasher, 143, 144—contradictions of the Scriptures in it, 144, 145—specimen of its pretended notes, 146, 147—additional proofs of its contradictions of the Books of Moses and Joshua, 148, 149—Mr. Bond's edition of it an unacknowledged reprint of Ilive's fabrication, 149, 150—notice of an Apocryphal Hebrew Book of Jasher, 150.

## L.

*Labour-rate* for employing the poor, effects of, 221, 222.

*Laud* (Archbishop), difference between, and Archbishop Abbot, on ecclesiastical polity, 72—unjustly charged with being a concealed papist, 72, 73.

*Liturgies*, antiquity of, 25, 26.

*Lyell* (Charles, Esq.), sketch of his view of the rise and progress of geology, 336—341—his observations on the causes of vicissitudes in temperature, 342—344—abstract of his theory of the progressive development of organic life, 345—349—remarks thereon, 349—ascribes the changes in the earth's surface to one uninterrupted succession of physical events governed by the laws now in operation, 350—352—his table of recent and tertiary formations, 353—his scheme of geology inconsistent with the Scripture narrative, 356—360—his views of the Mosaic deluge, 360—362—their inconsistency with Scripture, 362.

## M.

*Martyrs*, number of, during the persecutions of the early Christians, 16, 17.

*Melvill* (Rev. Henry), Remarks on the Sermons of, 195, 196—extracts from them, with observations, 197—205—207—209.

*Mohammed's* pretended miraculous journey to Heaven, described, 118—121—prophecies pretended by him to be fulfilled in his person, 116, 117.

*Mohammedanism* compared with Christianity, and its inferiority to the latter, 111—116—extent of the Mohammedan conquests, 123—125—remarks on the decline of the Mohammedan empire, 125, 126.

## N.

*National Education*. See *Education*.

*National Libraries*, remarks on the present system of, 97—99.

*Neptunian* theory of Geology, notice of, 339.

*Nolan* (Rev. Dr.), Plan of the Bampton Lectures of, 412, 413—character of them, 414.

## O.

*Oneida-Indian*, Christian settlement, notice of, 303, note †.

## P.

*Palmer's* (Rev. William) *Antiquitates Litterariæ*, character of, 24—result of his researches, 25.

*Paul's* (St.) Epistle to the Romans, main object of, 85, 86—observations on the fourth chapter, 91—93—of the seventh chapter, 93—95—and of the eighth and ninth chapters, 87—91.

*Pepys*, character of, 174, 175.

*Philosophers* (Heathen), the persecutors of Christianity, 16.

*Polytheism* (Classic), character of, 13, 14,

*Poor-Laws*, evils of the allowance system under, and impositions practised in order to obtain pecuniary allowance, 211—214—successful instances of the administration of existing laws, 215—217—the mal-administration of the poor laws, the causes of the evils of pauperism, 217—design and enactments of

VOL. XV.

the statute of Elizabeth, 217, 218—evil consequences of departing from it, 218—220—beneficial effect of a judiciously conducted workhouse system, 221—on the effect of a labour rate, 221, 222—effects of the laws respecting bastardy, 222—results of the existing system of poor laws, 225, 226.

*Powell* (Rev. Baden), remarks on his rejection of the literal interpretation of the Mosaic narrative, 415, 416. 418—421—on his attempt to separate the Old from the New Testament, and also the physics of the Bible from its history and doctrines, 422—433—character of his treatises on Natural Philosophy, 434.

*Professors* (Scottish), remarks on the conduct of some, in undermining the authority of Scripture, 314, 315.

*Protestant Testimonies*, observations on the supposed unbroken series of, to the great truths of the Gospel, 34—37.

*Psalms* of David, character of, 154—specimens of versions of, in blank verse, 156—159—character of Sternhold's and Hopkin's, and Tate's and Brady's versions, 159—specimens of the latter compared with the Prayer-Book version, 160—suggestions for obtaining uniformity in the Psalmody of the Church of England, 161.

## R.

*Registration* (Civil), advantages of, 496.

*Romish Church*, hostility of, to the Protestantism of England, 66, 67.

## S.

*Scotland*, ineffectual efforts of Charles I. to restore church property in, 64—disaffection, how promoted by the Scottish covenanters, 65—they negotiate with foreign powers against him, 65, 66—difficulties of the king in relation to them, 74—failure of his efforts in settling the affairs of the Scottish Church, 78—80—state of tithes in Scotland, 80—perils of travelling through a Scottish mountain pass, 396.

*Sermons*, observations on the style of, 205—207.

*Sharp* (Archbishop), admirable letter of, on the Book of Common Prayer, 403, 404.

*Swartz* (Christian Frederick), humility of, 363—materials for his life, 364—noble

M M

retractation of Bishop Heber respecting him, 365—his intellectual powers, 367—his birth and education, 367, 368—goes to India as a Missionary of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 368—his admirable mode of conversing with the Heathens, 369—scrupulous care in preparing converts for Baptism, 370—misrepresentation of his proceedings by Sir Montgomery Campbell, 371—Swartz's triumphant refutation of it, and vindication of his proceedings, 371—376—the unimpeachable purity of his life, 377—fidelity of his addresses to Europeans, 377, 378—his judicious mode of dealing with the prejudices of the natives, 378—380—character of his sermons, 384, 385—description of him in advanced age, 385—his disinterested political conduct in Indian affairs, first in his negotiations with Hyder Ali, 386—then with Tippo Saib, 387—and in the affairs of Tanjore, 388, 389—Lord Teignmouth's testimony to his character, 390—his death, and honours paid to his memory, 391, 392.

## T.

*Thoresby* (Ralph), biographical anecdotes of, 394, 395—character of his *Ducatus Leodiensis*, 393—his perilous adventure in travelling through a Scottish pass, 396—account of his journey to London, 397—adventures in pursuit of a wife, 398, 399—his marriage, 399—his description of the terror prevalent in the northern counties during the retreat of the Irish in 1688. 399—401—affecting letter to him, 401—perils in another journey to London, 402—admirable letter of Archbishop Sharp to him, on conforming to the Church of England, 403—405—trifling nature of his diary, 405, 406—letters of Mr. Bland to him, on the interpretation of Psalm xc. 10, 407, 408—of Edmund Hickerlingill, 408—410—and of the Rev. Joseph Cookson, 411.

1281 P  
20

## U.

*Usher* (Archbishop), anecdotes of, 163—165.

## V.

*Vulcanian*, theory of Geology, notice of, 3, 39, 340.

## W.

*Waddington* (Rev. George), general character of his *History of the Church*, 2, 3—observations on his literal churchmanship, 3, 4—and on his assertion that the episcopal form of ministry was not established at Corinth in A. D. 95, 5—9—his observation on the the spirit of freedom in the religion of Christ, under the administration of the primitive Episcopal Church, 10—12—on the indulgent character of the classic polytheism, 12, 13—his account of the persecution of the Emperor Marcus Antoninus, 14—16.

*Wall* (W. E.), specimen of his "Christ Crucified," with remarks, 39—48.

*Wardlaw* (Dr.), observations of, on the conduct of some Scottish Professors in evading the authority of Scripture, 315—confirmed by Dr. Chalmers, 316—remarks on Dr. W.'s opinion of the actual fallen state of men, 315, 316—321—on his want of candour in commenting on an anonymous writer on the object of ethics, 324—and in interpreting an expression of Dr. Brown, 324, 325—his sentiments on Hutcheson's theory of the moral sense, 325—remarks thereon, 326—vindication of Bishop Butler from his strictures, 327—331—on the state of man before the fall, 331—his just notions in regard to conscience, 332—the practical rules of duty, 333—character of his treatise on Christian ethics, 334.

*Wilson* (Bishop), character and anecdotes of, 170, 171.

*Workhouse* system of managing the poor, instances of the successful adoption of, 215—217. 221.

L O N D O N :

PRINTED BY C. ROWORTH AND SONS,  
BELL-YARD, TEMPLE-BAR.







